DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 043 283	HE 001 727

TITLE	Report of Conference on the Undergraduate Education of Women July 8-10, 1969.
INSTITUTION	Cedar Crest Coll., Allentown, Pa.
SPONS AGENCY	Phillips (Ellis L.) Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Oct 69
NOTE	90p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.60
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Needs, *Feminism, *Higher Education, *Institutional Role, Research Needs, *Sex Differences, *Womens Education

ABSTRACT

The main objective of this conference, which was sponsored by 18 women's colleges, was to explore the educational validity of women's colleges in the context of the following factors: (1) implications of research findings on differences in traits between the sexes as they affect the education of women; (2) present and projected roles for women; and (3) the growing trend toward coeducation. The conference addressed itself to: (1) whether a case could be made for proceeding differently in certain respects in the education of women from the education of men; (2) opportunities and obligations of women's colleges in responding to special considerations in the education of women; and (3) identification of areas where inadequate or nonexistent research data need to be supplemented. This report lists: (1) the cosponsoring colleges; (2) the resource persons; (3) the conference program; (4) the participants; (5) the objectives of the conference; and (6) the summary. Presentations by Dwight W. Chapman on sex differences as they might relate to women's education, and by Alice S. Rossi on a study of a selected group of women college graduates are included in the appendix, as well as a background summary for the conference and excerpts of remarks by Pauline Tompkins. (AF)

ED0 43283

Report of Conference

On

THE UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION OF WOMEN

July 8 - 10, 1969

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Cedar Crest College
Allentown, Pennsylvania

HE001727

FOREWORD

The Conference on the Undergraduate Education of Women was held at Cedar Crest College, Allentown, Pennsylvania on July 8-10, 1969, under the sponsorship of eighteen women's colleges representing diverse affiliation, size, and geographic location. In addition to the delegates from the sponsoring institutions, participants from Cornell, George Washington, Johns Hopkins, Smith, the University of Pennsylvania College of Liberal Arts for Women, and Vassar were present.

Grants from the Ellis L. Phillips Foundation and the United States Steel Foundation, Inc., supplied the funding.

The conference summary included in this report is a collation drawn from the transcript of the proceedings to compress the substance as it related to the conference objectives. Consequently, direct quotations have not been employed. A full record of the proceedings is on file at Cedar Crest College and available for loan on request.

The conference is viewed as one of many steps in an ongoing consideration of the undergraduate education of women, a continuing process of evaluation and study. Another step under way is the drafting of a statement on "The Women's College in Tomorrow's World, Obligation and Opportunity" currently being considered by the participating institutions.

Great appreciation is accorded all who were involved in the conference--the foundations who supported it, the resource consultants, the Cedar Crest faculty committee, and the delegates from the colleges who responded with stimulating and responsible contributions that evidenced a commitment to the concerns not only of their institutions but to the education of women.

CONTENTS

Co-sponsoring Colleges. vii

Resource Persons. .viii

Conference Program. ix

Conference Participants xii

Conference Objective. xvi

Conference Summary. 1

Appendix I - Presentations by Dwight W. Chapman, Jr.. .17

Appendix II - Presentations by Alice S. Rossi. 29

Appendix III - Background Summary 56

Appendix IV - Excerpts From Presentations
by Pauline Tompkins. 62

CO-SPONSORING COLLEGES

Agnes Scott

Beaver

Bennett

Cedar Crest

Chatham

Connecticut College

Douglass

Emmanuel

Goucher

Hollins

Hood

Mills

Mount Holyoke

Mundelein

Randolph-Macon Woman's College

Simmons

Spelman

Sweet Briar

Wellesley

Wilson

RESOURCE PERSONS

Charles E. Adkins, President, Commission for
Independent Colleges and Universities
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Dwight W. Chapman, Jr., Professor Emeritus
of Psychology, Vassar College

Alice S. Rossi, Research Associate, Department
of Social Relations, The Johns Hopkins
University

Elizabeth Tidball, Department of Physiology,
George Washington University Medical
Center

Sheila Tobias, Assistant to the Vice President
for Academic Affairs, Cornell University

Kenneth M. Wilson, Director, College Research
Center, Poughkeepsie, New York

THE PROGRAM

Tuesday, July 8

3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.
Registration -- New Residence Hall

5:00 p.m.
Reception -- President's Residence

6:30 p.m.
Dinner -- Curtis Hall

8:00 p.m.
Opening Session -- New Residence Hall

Margery S. Foster, Dean of the College, Douglass College, presiding

Introductory remarks -- Pauline Tompkins, President
Cedar Crest College

Discussion

Wednesday, July 9

8:00 a.m. to 8:30 a.m.
Breakfast -- Curtis Hall

9:00 a.m.
Reports of Recent Research

Phyllis Fleming, Dean of the College and Professor of Physics Wellesley College, presiding

Mr. Chapman

Mr. Wilson

10:30 a.m.
Break

10:45 a.m.
Research Reports

Mary Woods Bennett, Dean of the Faculty, Mills College, presiding

Mrs. Rossi

Discussion

THE PROGRAM--Continued

Wednesday, July 9

12:15 p.m.
Lunch -- Curtis Hall

1:30 p.m.
Sharing of college self-studies and programs

Eugene Hotchkiss, Executive Dean, Chatham College, presiding

Discussion

3:15 p.m.
Break

3:45 p.m.
Group discussions of how existing research and goals can be applied to

1. Student Life
2. Curriculum and Educational Program
3. Counseling, placement, roles
4. Pedagogy
5. Community involvement

5:30 p.m.
Reception -- President's Residence

6:30 p.m.
Dinner -- Curtis Hall

8:00 p.m.
Reactor Panel

Rhoda Dorsey, Dean, Goucher College, presiding

William F. Quillian, Jr., President, Randolph-Macon
Woman's College

Martha Church, Dean of the College, Wilson College

Miss Tobias

Discussion

THE PROGRAM--Continued

Thursday, July 10

8:00 a.m. to 8:30 a.m.
Breakfast -- Curtis Hall

9:00 a.m.
Open Forum -- New Residence Hall

John A. Logan, Jr., President Hollins College, presiding

10:15 a.m.
Break

10:30 a.m.
Research Ideas

Randle Elliott, President, Hood College, presiding

Mr. Chapman

Mrs. Rossi

12:15 p.m.
Lunch -- Curtis Hall

1:15 p.m.
Conference Summary, Miss Church

Henry F. Pommer, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Faculty, Cedar Crest College, presiding

2:30 p.m.
Adjournment

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

AGNES SCOTT COLLEGE - Decatur, Georgia 30030

Julia T. Gary, Dean
Laura Steele, Registrar and Dean of Admissions

BEAVER COLLEGE - Glenside, Pennsylvania 19038

Edward Gates, President
David Gray, Vice President
Marjorie Darling, Director of Admissions

CEDAR CREST COLLEGE - Allentown, Pennsylvania 18104

Pauline Tompkins, President
Henry F. Pommer, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Faculty
Ruth B. Dent, Trustee

CHATHAM COLLEGE - Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15232

Eugene Hotchkiss, Executive Dean of the College
Arthur G. Smith, Assistant Professor of History

DOUGLASS COLLEGE - New Brunswick, New Jersey 08903

Margery Somers Foster, Dean
Mariam Brush, Associate Professor of Home Economics

EMMANUEL COLLEGE - Boston, Massachusetts

Sister Ann Bartholomew, President
Sister Marie Barry, Academic Dean
Sister Ann Sharry, Director of Residence
Sister Janet Eisner, Director of Admissions

GOUCHER COLLEGE - Towson, Maryland 21204

Marvin B. Perry, Jr., President
Rhoda Dorsey, Dean
Noel Farley, Professor, Chairman, Department of Economics

HOLLINS COLLEGE - Hollins College, Virginia 24020

John A. Logan, Jr., President
John P. Wheeler, Jr., Dean of the College

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS--Continued

HOOD COLLEGE - Frederick, Maryland 21701

Randle Elliott, President
Mary Frear Keeler, Dean of the Faculty
Catherine S. Chilman, Dean of the Faculty (July 1)

MILLS COLLEGE - Oakland, California 94613

Mary Woods Bennett, Dean of the Faculty

MOUNT HOLYOKE COLLEGE - South Hadley, Massachusetts 01075

David B. Truman, President
Anthony E. Farnham, Assistant Professor of English and Director of Fact Finding Study on Coeducation
James B. Austin, Trustee

MUNDELEIN COLLEGE - Chicago, Illinois

Sister Dorothy Franklin, Director of Admissions

RANDOLPH-MACON WOMAN'S COLLEGE - Lynchburg, Virginia 24504

William F. Quillian, Jr., President
Shirley Strickland, Associate Professor of Sociology and Anthropology

SIMMONS COLLEGE - Boston, Massachusetts 02115

William F. Kahl, Provost
Jonathan Ehrenworth, Counseling and Career Planning Center

SPELMAN COLLEGE - Atlanta, Georgia 30314

Albert Manley, President
Marcia Halvorsen, Chairman, Economics Department

SWEET BRIAR COLLEGE - Sweet Briar, Virginia 24595

Anne G. Pannell, President
Richard Rowland, Professor of English, Chairman Sweet Briar Self-Study Committee

WILSON COLLEGE - Chambersburg, Pennsylvania 17201

Martha Church, Dean of the College
Lucetta Mowry, Trustee

WELLESLEY COLLEGE - Wellesley, Massachusetts 02181

Phyllis Fleming, Dean of the College, Professor of Physics
Mary Lefkowitz, Assistant Professor of Greek and Latin
Mrs. E. Norman Staub, Trustee

* * * * *

CEDAR CREST COLLEGE

Conference Committee

Patricia Sacks, Librarian
John Flautz, Associate Professor of English
Leona Nelson, Professor of Sociology

Committee on Long-Range Educational Planning

James Gottshall, Professor of English
Marion Kayhart, Professor of Biology
Charles McAnall, Assistant Professor of Music
Judith Deak, Student
Ruthanne Di Liberti, Student

* * * * *

RESOURCE PERSONS

Charles E. Adkins, President
Commission for Independent Colleges and Universities
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17101

Dwight Chapman, Department of Psychology
Vassar College
Poughkeepsie, New York

Alice S. Rossi, Research Associate
The Johns Hopkins University
Baltimore, Maryland 21218

Shelia Tobias, Cornell
Assistant to the Vice President for Academic Affairs
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York

RESOURCE PERSONS--Continued

Elizabeth Tidball, Department of Physiology
George Washington University Medical Center
13339 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

Kenneth M. Wilson, Director
College Research Center
Poughkeepsie, New York

* * * * *

OTHERS

Jean Brownlee, Dean
College of Liberal Arts for Women
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Ely Chinoy, Department of Sociology and Anthropology
Smith College
Northampton, Massachusetts

Mary Jo Clark
602 South First Street
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48103

Jennie Farley, Graduate Student
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York

Amalie R. Shannon - Conference Coordinator

CONFERENCE OBJECTIVE

Objective: To explore the educational validity of women's colleges in the context of such factors as

1) implications of differences in traits between the sexes
2) present and projected roles for women, and
3) the growing trend toward coeducation

What are the implications of current research related to the education of women?

Can a case be made for proceeding somewhat differently in certain respects in the education of women than in the education of men?

If special objectives are needed in the education of women, can they be more readily achieved in a women's college than in a coeducational institution?

What possible programs, emphases, pilot experiments and procedures appropriate to the education of women should women's colleges undertake today?

Are there areas where data are inadequate or nonexistent where research is needed?

CONFERENCE SUMMARY

The eighteen colleges participating in the Conference on the Undergraduate Education of Women at Cedar Crest College, Allentown, Pennsylvania, July 8-10, 1969, included institutions committed to remaining women's colleges, some having decided to become coeducational, and others still considering both possibilities. The delegates included members of faculty, staff, and boards of trustees as well as ten presidents of women's colleges.

Resource consultants and other participants came also from Cornell, George Washington, Johns Hopkins, Smith, the University of Pennsylvania College of Liberal Arts for Women, and Vassar.

The objective of the conference was to explore the educational validity of women's colleges in the context of such factors as

1) implications of research findings on differences in traits between the sexes as they affect the education of women;

2) present and projected roles for women;

3) the growing trend toward coeducation.

With this objective, the conference addressed itself to

1) whether a case could be made for proceeding somewhat differently in certain respects in the education of women than in the education of men;

2) opportunities and obligations of women's colleges in responding to special considerations in the education of women;

3) identification of areas where inadequate or nonexistent research data need to be supplemented.

On the final day the conference affirmed by a strong majority its belief that from an educational point of view in meeting the needs of diverse individuals within our society, women's colleges should continue as one option among institutions of higher education. It authorized a small group to formulate a statement developing from the thinking of the conference discussions for circulation to the participating institutions and, in a final form, for wide distribution.

The conference agenda, although flexible, had a progression paralleling the statement of the objective. This summary reports the conference substance as it is related to the statement of objectives.

Implications of Research on Differences in Traits Between the Sexes as they Affect the Education of Women

Resource persons presented recent data indicative of the kinds of research being done related to differences in traits between the sexes and on women's achievements in higher education, as well as diverse data significant in the education of women.

It was noted that most psychologists and sociologists consider present sexual differences not genetic, but very heavily weighted with the cultural practices of the societies in which men and women live. Further, there were numerous cautions against stereotyping into masculine and feminine designations and against overlooking the fact that differences between men and women are part of the broad range of human personal differences which vary in degree of sex-relatedness. There was also recognition that most studies are based on instruments which contain criteria biased in favor of the educational and occupational world of men.

The problems involved in the analysis of data and its application to basic administrative and educational projections were discussed. Two related positions were expressed: 1) that decisions about coeducation and similar directions should be made on a philosophical basis clearly formulated and supported by a college rather than on research results, and 2) that research findings as the best source of knowledge about human beings in college can be important in determining that philosophy. The opinion was expressed that the big research job is to find out whether a college's philosophy is indeed being implemented by what is being done in the educational system.

Conferees were alert to the rapidity of change in our society and to the revolution in social patterns and mores which might well invalidate past experience and data as guides to the immediate future on college campuses. Changed attitudes and behavioral expectations need to be reflected in institutional operations such as curriculum, recruitment, etc. A concomitant concern strongly expressed was for the provision of continuing processes of up-to-date research information to guide decisions and provide for self-correcting procedures in colleges.

Dr. Chapman reported on sex differences in capacities, skills and aptitudes, in interests, and in response to the educational process itself. (See Appendix II.) He stressed that the study of possible differences or specialties in the education of men and women is really also an examination of differences among people in general, that where there have been demonstrable differences between populations of men and populations of women, there are still highly overlapping populations.

Dr. Rossi reported on her study of a selected group of women college graduates. (See Appendix III.) She also called attention to hard data from economics with current projections of enrollment and of the declining proportion of students that are going to be represented by private institutions. As further illustration of available "hard" data she cited demographic research, specifically, the fluctuating birthrate with differential size in the number of available cohorts, affecting marriage potential.

Dr. Wilson presented "Selected Data Pertaining to the Higher Education of Women," commenting on women's share of college degrees in selected years; the percentage of women among professional administrative, instructional and research personnel in higher institutions; doctorates earned by graduates of selected colleges and universities; popularity of types of colleges with National Merit participants; relative attractiveness to eleventh grade students of universities and liberal arts colleges; freshman-senior differences in career, outlook, and attitude toward women's role in society by students in the class of 1968 from several liberal arts colleges for women, and selected findings from the College Research Center studies of student characteristics and performance. (These tables were distributed at the conference.)

Dr. Tidball reported on an informal study of data from the Fifth Edition of Who's Who of American Women. She concluded that the probability for graduates of women's colleges being listed there is greater, proportionate to the number of graduates, than for women graduates of coeducational colleges. When considering marital status, the relative likelihood of being listed is greatest among single graduates of women's colleges, with married graduates of women's colleges being next in line. Combining the marital status data, the comparison is that graduates of women's colleges are two and one-half times more likely to be listed than women graduates of coeducational colleges. It was noted, however, that social stratification and religious affiliation are factors that compound the differences and affect the validity of the findings.

Present and Projected Roles for Women

Conferees recognized the present and projected roles and life styles for women, with most of the discussion directed to the middle class white woman. It was pointed out that with black women the roles with men are reversed and the perspective in coming to college is different.

Acknowledging that women's life styles have changed drastically in the last thirty years, participants discussed the special cultural needs of women who change roles and styles within a lifetime to accommodate work, marriage, family, and careers. There was a reminder that women had differing, very individual life styles, but research indicates that a professional career is much more important for men than for women. The participation profile of women in the labor force was felt by some to be the point of departure for adapting education to new life styles for women. The hope was expressed that there be attention by women's colleges to the fundamentally revolutionary nature of the world, the role of our nation in the context of military-political rivalries, cybercultural revolution and the projected roles and needs of both men and women in 1984 or 2000.

The preparation of women for service to the community through knowledge of economic, political, sociological and anthropological answers to social problems such as the poor in the affluent society was discussed. It was felt that women do bring a peculiar insight into many of the most pressing of our current problems, i.e., urban problems, communication arts, etc.

The hope was also voiced that in the follow-up of the kinds of issues discussed by the conference, more questions would be raised concerning various groups of women, both black and white, and not about women as if they were all alike.

The Growing Trend Toward Coeducation

A background summary paper was distributed to the conference participants briefly presenting some of the major reasons given by institutions for their decisions to move to coeducation or to remain women's colleges. (See Appendix III.) The trend of single-sex colleges to coeducation and to coordinate relationships has greatly accelerated in recent years, and the reasons advanced for the changes range from the frankly pragmatic to more subtle complex sociocultural rationales. Some felt that colleges have drifted into decisions to become coeducational without any clear educational rationale, thus really abandoning women's education without any educational statement or purpose. Apparently decisions to become coeducational have rarely been unanimous and have been made with much trepidation. Evaluation of the wisdom of such decisions will be difficult because rapidly changing conditions on all campuses make comparisons most complex.

The conference kept to a minimum ex post facto discussions of the rationalizing for the trend. The difficulty of assessing the real reasons in the light of the shared problems of all private, small, liberal arts colleges was recognized. It was felt that a combination of rising costs and student response to the bandwagon trend has brought reductions in applications to women's colleges. The view was expressed that the most prominent reason for going coeducational has been the clearly expressed dissatisfaction of students with the present social situation on single-sex campuses.

Some indication and limited data were given that the men students currently enrolling in women's colleges which have recently changed to coeducation are nonconformists, extremely liberal politically, and have a predominant interest in arts and the humanities.

Concern was expressed for the role of women students and provision for their needs in male institutions which have just turned coeducational. The tendency of men to take over in student government and student leadership in general may place women into substandard or "second class" citizenship roles. There appears to be little evidence that those institutions have done any preplanning for the needs of their women students. In fact, apparently most of the coeducational institutions are really male oriented.

The point was raised as to the artificial dichotomy involved in labeling institutions as unisex or coeducational, i.e., at what point does an institution become coeducational? What should be the projected balance of men and women?

One participant expressed the need for giving thought to and anticipating what kind of women students will choose to attend women's colleges as the group of such institutions becomes smaller and yet has to serve women with a variety of needs.

Conferees agreed that going coeducational would not solve the financial or enrollment problems of women's colleges because the facilities would have to be greatly expanded to provide for men and major adjustments made in projected enrollment plans.

Can a Case be Made for Proceeding Somewhat Differently in Certain Respects in the Education of Women than in the Education of Men?

This question - at the very heart of the conference considerations - was undoubtedly the most difficult and the most evasive of a conclusive consensus. The beginning point was inevitably the restatement of the obvious - that women are different from men. The deductions from this indisputable fact seemed to fall into two schools: 1) those who think this difference should be minimized through identical and simultaneous educational opportunities, and 2) those who think this difference should be maximized through equal but differing opportunities which take into account the essential differences, be they biological, cultural, psychological, traditional. The latter position is premised on the assumption that opportunities (educational or others) can be "equal" only when cognizance is taken of those differences whose very nature would make an identical education an unequal one.

Further, the point was made that these conclusions can be reached through different routes, i.e., women are different and complement men, and therefore they should be educated together; or women are different and therefore should be educated differently to take advantage of the differences. Or women are intellectually the same as men so should have the same chance by being in a place where they are not second-class citizens.

There was extensive discussion of evidences of the effects on women of the whole educational-cultural process. Reference was made to studies done on differences between female and male babies which indicate that gender identity is established at eighteen months by the external environment and by parental treatment, i.e., nurture. It was suggested that many aspirations of girls are well established before they get to college. Attention was drawn to the statement by the N.O.W. report of "badly damaged self-definition and ego strength on the part of women" before they get to college. Some felt that there is a need to "uneducate" women in college, an "unlearning" task to perform. Others cautioned on the distinction between education and indoctrination. Still others felt that certain qualities referred to in the discussion that students should be imbued with at the college level are not distinctive to women, that men have the same needs.

The matter of liberal arts training as well as pre-professional training brought out the difficulty of training women for occupations that may disappear before women are ready to enter them because of their involvement in their roles as wives and mothers.

One session presider posed the question: Shall we say we are very good and exciting places which happen to offer special things for women, or shall we go all the way as women's colleges and say, frankly, that we want to stay in business and that we have something in our program especially suited to the life styles of women?

In view of the research data presented at the conference, the changing roles and life styles of women, the cultural ambience of twentieth century America, indications of increasing demands by women for recognition (parallels were drawn to the black revolution), the paradox of the prospects and need for full opportunities for women and the discrimination against them, a majority of the delegates expressed a conviction that women's colleges need to make a statement of their case as institutions that are committed to the best possible educational experience for women.

Opportunities and Obligations of Women's Colleges in Responding to Special Considerations in the Education of Women

Through a sharing of individual college self-studies and programs and group discussions there seemed to evolve a consensus that inasmuch as women's colleges exist because of their belief in the necessity for educating women, this purpose brings with it an intrinsic obligation to give highest priority to the significance and effects of being a woman. If changes are to be effected in the transmitted cultural concepts of women's roles and aspirations, women's colleges could well be the context or impetus for experimentation and initiation of new concepts.

Certainly the argument could be made that coeducational institutions could play this and other related roles. But realistic appraisals at this point in history support the view that the multi-faceted universities and colleges can scarcely be expected to include research and innovation in the areas under discussion at the conference. Women's colleges with more manageable situations, smaller enrollments for the most part, less diverse aspirations and pressures, appear to be in a more advantageous position to respond to the increasing knowledge from the behavioral sciences about the differences from men in women's attitudes, learning patterns, needs and aspirations. (Institutions of learning, it was noted, although often leaders in research in a multitude of areas, lag in research of themselves, and in responding to research affecting them.) Experiments in pedagogy and curriculum in response to the findings of such research could be pioneering efforts. If new programs were initiated by the women's colleges, coeducational institutions could take them over in time, and the women's colleges move on to other innovative roles.

Also, the women's college perhaps can better help society to benefit from women's being able to play an effective role. One consultant stated that unless people in women's colleges consider seriously the problems of women both as students and as adults, no one else is going to consider them. Another expressed the hope that everyone presently in women's colleges, some of which are going coeducational and some which are not, would in part of their minds nurture the thought that they are - and ought to be - guinea pigs.

The limitations as well as the advantages of the small size of most women's colleges were discussed in relation to the diversity of offerings and programming in meeting new fields developing in the communication arts, etc. Specialization by individual colleges in innovative programs or in strengthening existing programs was suggested as a way of preserving both advantages. A women's college might be particularly adaptive because it is small and humanistic, and thus could more readily work with individuals.

Other areas in which it was felt that women's colleges could make special contributions were in attacking the "emptiness" problem of many young people in our society and in still valuing the somewhat "monastic" approach of detachment in viewing diverse problems.

There was a reminder of the obligation to try to maintain an awareness of differences in individual human beings, not only differences by sex, through allowing them different kinds of educational opportunities without getting into the futile position of trying to say which are better and which are justified. One delegate observed that if women's colleges were to go under as the result of failure to provide a quality, individualized student-focused education, after a few decades some bold and imaginative innovators would establish women's colleges on an experimental basis.

It was pointed out that some of the experiments in the past in trying to develop women's colleges with a distinctive flavor have boomeranged. Also, that although it might be considered easier for wholly new institutions to be created for women with the objective of establishing a distinctive program, in looking at such institutions founded in the thirties and the appeal they had in their earlier years as pioneer institutions, this suggestion does not seem promising.

With all these considerations, there were numerous suggestions of possible programs, emphases, pilot experiments and procedures appropriate to the education of women which women's colleges might undertake. These included:

1. Cooperative relationships among women's colleges such as
    a. Mutual exchange of names of non-graduate alumnae who left in good standing so that they could be encouraged to complete their studies for a degree in the area where another college is located;
    b. A consortium of women's colleges keeping in touch regularly with reading materials, discussion groups, etc., providing laboratory experiences for mothers and wives to move into employment later;

   c. Cooperation in efforts to establish full-time personnel in institutional research;

   d. Pooling of information about college women.

2. Flexible and innovative curriculum

   a. Curricular and pedagogical experimentation on how women can bring their different insights and values to bear on pressing problems of society, thus translating the unique needs of women into the curriculum;

   b. Specialization of offerings and phasing out of others by individual colleges strengthening current or new areas in curriculum, and support of exchange programs and consortiums among colleges;

   c. Emphasis on independent study to meet needs of women graduates for self-starting and self-propelling education during various periods in life cycles and changing roles when they are not involved in formal education.

   d. Courses or seminars in such subjects as Problems in Higher Education, Science and Public Policy, or Developmental Psychology which would include the special cultural role, contributions, needs and problems of women, anticipating change not merely reacting to it;

   e. Working to eliminate culturally imposed choices of subjects as "feminine" or "masculine", and offering so-called "hard" sciences so women can deal with a technological society on a competitive basis;

   f. Suggestions were offered for more problem-oriented courses, fewer broad survey courses, focused interest in freshman year, or major in first two years with broader study in last two.

3. Innovation in educational programs

   a. Imaginative programming in finding stimulating experiences off campus to do away with disenchantment of women students during certain college years in developmental process in which the needs of women change and the relevance of the context shifts: guest opportunities at other institutions for semester or year; year's leave of absence; relationship with university setting;

   b. More flexibility in transfer of grades to other institutions;

   c. Special advantages in admission of black women and their contributions as role models;

   d. Special programs for mature women with flexible admission standards, supplementary funding, and recruitment of graduates under thirty-five to give them awareness of evolving occupations and professions;

   e. Career planning and counseling for women as well as men (boyfriends, fiances, husbands);

   f. Field experiences in action programs to help students act on their drives for relevancy and social change and to develop persons able to confront problems of society.

4. Other possibilities

   a. Building a kind of ambience on campuses which reflects and is responsive and sensitive to the individual needs of women as human beings, apart from men, through a combination of counseling and curriculum;

b. Flexibility in admission requirements to people in so-called disadvantaged categories and in evaluating or accepting experience as basis for admission or even admission with advanced standing;

c. Desirability of presence of students at departmental meetings to discuss curriculum and teaching policy, assisting students in developing competence and security and satisfying the need to have a voice in areas which affect them directly;

d. Initiation of services that would also serve as laboratories on the campus: child care centers, family counseling, career counseling;

e. More college budget for training faculty as resource people in counseling;

f. Stress on leadership training to instill confidence transferable to later life; bring in women leaders to campuses to discuss the realities of leadership involving men;

g. Make contribution by affecting public policy in relation to women in employment and in the home, because men who usually set policy are not aware of the women's point of view;

h. Administrators of women's colleges take lead in calling together administrators from other institutions to discuss the education of women and their goals.

Identification of Areas Where Inadequate or Nonexistent Research Data Are Needed

Emerging from the exchange of ideas throughout the conference, numerous suggestions were made of areas in which the participants felt the need for further research. These suggestions included the following:

1. That a consortium of colleges compile research issues related to questions and experiments needed and use the same instruments so that data would be both more conclusive and more comparable.

2. That comparable data on students in men's colleges and in coeducational institutions is needed in addition to data from women's colleges to establish any validity for conclusions regarding the impact of various factors on students at women's colleges.

3. That research is needed on educational policies or practices of varying institutions to determine how different kinds of students or particular features of the college environment determine effects already observed. Need for asking questions such as

    a. Do the educational objectives, emphases and practices of liberal arts colleges for women actually differ in any significant way from those of coeducational colleges?

    b. Do their counseling programs differ?

    c. Is there any implicit or explicit observable or detectable indication that the colleges themselves acknowledge any difference between men and women?

    d. Are significant differences in educational outcome attendant upon patterns of coeducational experience as opposed to patterns involving separate education when such factors as level of student ability and aspirations of student and the educational program are controlled?

4. That there is need for demographic studies on the 17-year-old students' needs, expectations, and thinking in choosing to come to a women's college.

5. That there is need for economic analysis in the framework of long-range planning of colleges, economic feasibility of cluster colleges, etc.

6. That there is need to be alert to research in immediate future of developments in colleges going coeducational: types of men who enroll, types of women, etc. This is a special sector of information to watch carefully in the immediate future.

7. That more research is needed on differences that are sex-related at very early ages in both interests and value as well as in cognitive areas.

8. That particular areas of research needed in relation to women include:

   a. Effect of whole educational-cultural process on women's egos;

   b. Incidence of marriage among bright young women in relation to incidence among other women;

   c. Relationship between the likelihood of early marriage and the type of undergraduate institution attended;

   d. Research on decreasing expectation of women's performance in leadership roles during a period when there has been an enormous increase in coeducation in the nation - any relationship?

9. Suggestions related to colleges themselves

a. Research on the dedication of varying kinds of colleges to a service goal. Is there a difference between the unisex and the coed, the church-related and private independent? To what extent have colleges succeeded in providing people with motivation for service? How can we evaluate the products of our colleges - by how useful they are?

b. How popular are women's colleges among girls of high ability? What are the trends in this regard? Have there been any changes in the relative popularity of various types of collegiate institutions among high ability girls?

c. Research on the spread of majors and reasons for majors in women's colleges as compared to other institutions;

d. Research on the interest and potential interest or reasons for interest in graduate school;

e. More research about faculty at women's colleges; what brings and keeps them there, what difference between men and women faculty; roles as advisers, etc.

At the concluding session of the conference, participants reaffirmed a commitment to women's education and to a continuing involvement in study and evaluation of the role of women's colleges in a dynamic world. That each institution ultimately would reach its own decision about its future role in relation to the education of women was a basic understanding permeating all conference deliberations. As an immediate continuation of the conference initiative, a small group was charged with drafting a statement of the case for the women's college as a possible nucleus for consensus. It was also suggested that the participating institutions keep in touch with what each has done as a result of the conference or perhaps spurred by it. The possibility of a second conference as a follow-up in 1970 of at least a nuclear group from the institutions represented was also kept in mind.

The conference adjourned in anticipation of continuing relationships and exchange in the developments in the education of women.

Amalie R. Shannon

APPENDIX I

PRESENTATIONS BY DWIGHT W. CHAPMAN, JR.

Wednesday Morning Session, July 9, 1969

I would plead that I am not a research expert in the field in which I am called upon to talk. I got into this, I think mainly simply because at one point when Vassar was vigorously agitating whether she would become coeducational or would remain Matthew Vassar's female college, the Dean asked me to do a report for her on sex differences as they might relate to women's education, men's education, education in general -- higher education -- which I did, and leaning upon the research of others. Therefore, I am talking I think mainly as someone who reacts to research rather than, you know, a great generator of it.

It seems to me that when one asks, What are research facts that could bear on the question of the education of women, this falls into several rather distinct parts. First of all, one can ask the question, Are there sound scientific reasons for believing that women are just basically differently enough constituted so that this might have a bearing on the education that was most appropriate for them? Of course, immediately as soon as one asks that question, one is aware -- and I am sure everyone is aware -- of the fact that research findings of a modern sort are not generally such as to give great support to the notion that there are present sexual differences that are just plain genetic -- that women are born that way and men are born some other way, and never the twain shall meet; rather, it would be the suspicion of every psychologist and sociologist that we find as sexual differences are at least very, very, very heavily weighted with the cultural practices of the societies in which men and women grow up. So, no one in his right mind starts out with any very great hope or great desire to discern those things which are genetically different between men and women.

In the second place, the whole research field is affected, I think, by a couple of things: first, that we have quite a lot of information on average sexual differences -- differences between average, statistically average men and women, but that we have precious little knowledge about how it is that the culture induces these things. We have hints. We feel quite sure that little boys and little girls are inevitably told by their parents and the culture in general that they are going to grow up to be big boys and big girls, that men do certain things and women do certain things, and these are part of your expectation, this is what you are going to be like when you mature; and so you do mature that way. Of course, this is reinforced by a lot of the new psychological evidence that even white rats will perform in a way that is in line with what the experimenter expects them or wants them to do, and perhaps we know almost as little about how the human being picks this up as we do about how a white rat can possible pick it up from the human experimenter.

Finally, it seems to me -- and this is by way of stating what seems to me the important context in which to look at this research -- that we are always in danger of forgetting that when we talk about male-female differences, the differences between masculinity and feminity in our culture, the differences between the average male student and the average female student, there is always the danger that we could slip into just plain stereotypes of that sort. What we are really talking about in such cases, in cases in which there have been demonstrable differences between populations of men and populations of women, are highly overlapping populations, of course. To be specific, there is, I think, no doubt that it is a research fact that, on average, men are better problem-solvers where the problem requires cold analysis of the problem, as it may in mathematics and many of the sciences; but that statement would be made grotesque by anyone's assuming that, you know, all men are excellent problem-solvers and all women are simply lousy at it.

What is the case is that in a population of men, you can turn up somewhat more excellent problem-solvers than you can in a population of women. What is true, correspondingly, is that there are many women who are far better problem-solvers than many men; that the worst man problem-solver is far worse than most women, just as perhaps the best male problem-solver in those fields is better than a very substantial proportion of women.

This leads also to a conclusion that seemed clear to me about the relevance of research to the problem of the education of women and of men, too, and that is that what one really sees in looking at the differences between men and women is a broad range of human personal differences which are anywhere from a little bit to fairly strongly sex linked. If you turn up differences, cognitive differences in the way of learning material, you are really talking about those differences that occur among men and among women, although the two populations aren't quite the same. One population extends a little bit more in one direction; the other population a little more in the other direction.

Well, the practical consequence of that, or the philosophical consequence of it, seems to me to be that an interest in possible differences or specialties in the education of men and women is really also an examination of the problem of variety and accommodation and recognition of differences among people in general. As I have said in one of the papers, in the area of mathematics it seems pretty clear on the basis of research that, on average, less often are women students able to gain insights or speed their comprehension of a mathematical problem by a geometrical analogy. This is consistent with other research that shows that, on average -- and again I keep stressing that because it is only on average -- men somewhat better or more quickly or more facilely handle perceptual spatial relations. But it would also be true that there is a large population of men who, relative to others, are, if you want to say so in quotes, a little more feminine than some other men and whose ability to use geometrical analogies to speed their mathematical thinking is lower than that of many women and, therefore, if one were to come to the conclusion (which seems to me quite possible) that the conventional teaching of mathematics, since it has been based on the work of men who were preëminently skilled in the field, has leaned largely on pedagogical devices which are suitable for a part of the population, highly suitable, and perhaps highly unsuitable for another part of the population, and if one wanted to experiment with novel ways of teaching mathematics, these novel ways would be advantageous to a considerable number of men and a considerable number of women, and it may be of some importance that it would be advantageous to more women than men but nevertheless a pedagogical advance in that field would be an advance that human beings generally might profit from.

So, I do think that there is no good reason to suppose otherwise than that as we advance our research on sex differences, we will also be advancing our knowledge of individual differences, and that segregated education or coeducation, whichever -- never mind -- these will also offer the material for advances in education generally.

So, to a certain extent the research findings on sex differences do, yes, I think, bear somewhat on the education of women; but I am convinced, really, that they bear even more upon the education of human beings, male or female.

What are some of the differences? If one looks at them they fall into kind of rough groupings. One is differences in capacities or skills or aptitudes, and here perhaps is the hardest field to make sense of because, for example, general intelligence tests -- this might include the hypothesis that there were some male-female differences in general intelligence, but of course general intelligence tests were carefully designed and revised with a purpose in mind, and that was to obliterate any possible sex differences between them, because the sex differences for many purposes would be only a defect or an embarrassment, and the effort was to get at something much more common than that.

In the matter of skills, then, one can turn up several in which there appear to be reliable average sex differences that I have alluded to: Men seem to be able to tackle problems requiring analytic breakdown, an estimate of the problem to begin with, somewhat more easily than women; that women are more skilled, on average, than men at memorizing, at the clerical kinds of skill, detecting quickly errors and inconsistencies (proofreading is an earthy kind of example of that), perhaps more skilled at detecting the concrete aspects of certain problems where men excel somewhat more at recognizing general principles or at transferring general ideas from one kind of problem to another. There seem to be demonstrable differences in this way, again on average. Again, we are not talking about two distinct populations. We are talking about two populations that are slightly different with respect to each other.

Another set of differences comes not in abilities, and so on, but in interests: what people go for, what they aim at in purposes, including life purposes, and so on; and there, of course, there is a rich amount of material that strongly suggests that in our culture in a general way men may be more easily interested in things and women more interested in people, or men more interested in mechanical problems in a broad sense of that term and women more interested in social problems in a broad sense of that term.

On the other hand, I would add immediately a footnote that with the ferment going on presently among school and college-age young people, I am a little dubious as to whether that difference is going to hold up very long. I could fail to be surprised by its being somewhat softened by the intense shared concerns about human problems that we are seeing evidenced nowadays. I think, in short, our research, and a lot of research about men and women, is on the verge of becoming a little bit obsolete in the face of perhaps rapid cultural change in that age group.

And then, of course, there is some material, although it isn't very systematic, on how men and women respond to the educational process itself, to the classroom and to the ideas that float around in education, and here I think well-substantiated findings include such facts as that men students on the whole are less compliant with respect to the teacher and the institution, and so on; along with that, that women, along with and perhaps as a consequence of greater compliance, are superior at grade-getting at school and in college; that men's record of grades is more often spotty, with a tendency to put all their eggs in some basket that they are highly enthusiastic about and perhaps do superb work in a given field and not give much of a hoot as to what happens outside. This is a tendency, with a somewhat contrasting tendency of women students to be more dutifully concerned in trying to get an A in everything -- a good flat high record, and so on.

There is, I think, another thing that bears on education, particularly as education consists in student dialogue. There is certainly the frequent observation -- I don't know that there is too much good, hard data on this -- that men are more easily contentious, argumentative, questioning about what goes on; that that kind of verbal competitiveness is less attractive to women students who may even avoid it quite a bit. I have been looking at the reactions of the visiting men at Vassar this year -- seventy or so of them -- and it is interesting that when they are asked what they have least liked about Vassar, which turns out to be a place that on the whole they like very much, they say that what they have missed most, or been most disappointed by, or somewhat irritated by, or made curious by, is what seems to them a certain amount of passivity in class and outside class -- that the women students seldom argue with the instructors and that outside they seem seldom to engage in that real no-holds barred, knock-down bull session in which, as one says, your best friends will gladly cut your throat in any argument.

One question on the questionnaire that we have been using asks: "What is your impression of the toleration of the instructors that you have come in contact with this semester, their toleration for classroom argument and controversy?" Two or three of the men have not checked anything on the question and added, "What controversy? There isn't any."

Well, compared probably to their experience, there is less at Vassar, and it is an interesting question on which I think we have almost no research data as to what happens when you add men to the scene. What is going to happen to the dialogue in class? Is it going to be stimulated by the men or are the women students going to kind of draw off from it and let the men argue? There are a few research results that would suggest either conclusion as defensible. There are research results that show that in discussion groups of men alone and of women alone, the men's discussion groups are livelier and more controversial and more argumentative, which shows also that when the two are put together something even more lively can happen, as if the male tendency spread and was adopted by the females in that situation; and on the other hand, there is, I think, the evidence of anybody who has talked much with women college students that a great many of them feel that they would be inhibited and a little reluctant to show contentious intellectuality in the presence of males -- that this might prejudice their social life. On the other hand, they often aren't very contentious, anyway.

To try to sum up a little bit and speculate a little bit in this complicated field, there are certainly research results that display at present in our society a difference between male and female students in respects which are undoubtedly important for the process of becoming educated. These differences are statistically still more truly personal differences than sexual differences, though the sexual weighting is there.

Finally, just to throw out a speculative idea, there is a great question in my mind as to how such research results can be applied to the question of coeducation or separate education, and perhaps this amounts to saying that one of our research needs may be, so to speak, research on the problem of what kind of research would be useful anyway for the decisions that we face.

Still more speculatively, I would throw out the idea that it seems to me even more important that a college make its decision, yes, in the light of research results which tell it something reliable about the kinds of reality that exist as apart from those faculty meetings we have all squirmed through in which somebody gets up and says, "Well, I don't know a thing about it but I certainly feel that," etc.; but it is still more important that a college make its decision about coeducation on some philosophical basis that it clearly formulates and intends to sustain -- and this is for two reasons: I think the research results are not decisive for coeducation or non-coeducation; they are more decisive for education in general, and to a certain extent you can take your choice about coeducation or non-coeducation; but I think that whether anything happens importantly in coeducation or happens importantly in the college that decides not to participate in coeducation depends much more upon what kind of philosophy that college has embraced and has made candidates for the college aware of so that they select it with that philosophy in mind and come to a place that stands for X, and whether it will sustain that philosophy so that it has something indeed unique and attractive to offer.

I cannot bring myself to feel that research results are really going to be finally crucial for the kinds of arguments that are in our position paper, those extremely logical and plausible arguments for coeducation, against coeducation -- I am a little dubious as to whether those really hang on or can be made to hang on research findings, but I do think that research findings are important in thinking out a philosophy of education, because they do offer us the best that we have by way of a knowledge of what kind of human beings, what kind of variety among human beings, a college faces and, therefore, marks out somewhat what it has to do in fulfilling and maintaining whatever its educational philosophy really is.

Thursday Morning Session, July 10, 1969

I would begin with a little bit of "soap box" oratory, and that is, I very much hope that all of us in presently women's colleges, some of which are going coeducational and some of which are not, would in part of our minds carefully nurture the thought that we ought to be guinea pigs. We are. Certainly the women's college that decides to stay a women's college for what seem to me to be very defensible reasons is embarking on a new phase in its life. Things are going to change and it is going to be in a different setting from what it has been in the past, and also the women's college, like Vassar that has decided to go coeducational, realizes that it is doing so in a changing world and that it is doing so experimentally and is doing so, frankly, with some trepidation. This was not a unanimous sentiment of the faculty that sent us coeducational. It was not a unanimous sentiment of the students. It was not a unanimous sentiment of the alumnae, and for a while, at least, it was not a unanimous sentiment of the trustees. It was a majority sentiment but it was a majority sentiment that for a long time, and I think continually, respected and was impressed by the arguments for not doing so.

Perhaps our president summed it up very simply by saying that it seemed to him to be the general opinion -- it could be right or it could be wrong -- that the small, the independent college, male or female, was entering a period of crisis.

It had the problem of survival ahead of it. It seemed to him to be the consensus, with which he agreed, that that survival would be made even harder by staying a unisex institution -- and we could be wrong about that. Also, it is thoroughly admirable to try your best in hopes that that isn't so.

But let us all be guinea pigs, because I do believe that the greatest research need from here out is to find out what happens in both kinds of place. For example, I believe that at a place like Vassar we are going to have to put a lot of effort into finding out what it is like for a traditionally women's college to go coeducational, because I don't think the process of going coeducational can be easily dismissed as joining coeducational institutions where you become one of the crowd. No, we are different. A college that has traditionally built its reputation on being a women's college that goes coeducational is far different, it seems to me, from a college that has always been coeducational. It is a different thing and we must find out what happens as a consequence.

There is, it seems to me, the possibility that very good things may happen as a consequence, and some regrettable things might happen as a consequence. Specifically, as you know, and as I said, I have begun to be interested in trying to find out what kind of man comes to Vassar as she goes coeducational, and I think there are grounds for expecting that the man who comes to Vassar is going to be considerably different from the average man that one finds at an already long-standing coeducational institution.

One of the things that interests me is: I agree very strongly, both on research evidence and on anyone's experience as a teacher, that on a coeducational campus there is the severe problem and the severe threat for women on that campus that men have a tendency to take over or to be allowed to take over in student government and whatever. I am interested by the fact that I think I told you about, that the small sample of visiting men we have had this year turn out to be more highly respecting of women's autonomy and ambitions than are the Vassar women themselves. I therefore wonder whether there is the possibility that, in the atmosphere that will be created by the mix of the kind of men that happen to be attracted to Vassar and the girls we have there already, there will now perhaps be a better situation for the woman to compete successfully with the man than there is on the long-established coeducational campus. I don't know, but we had jolly well better find out, and find out not only for our own sakes but for the sake of all institutions that are debating this question, whatever their resolution of the question may be.

Similarly, I do believe that something is going to change about the women's college that elects to remain a women's college. For example, we have in a women's college, in any women's college today, I am convinced partly on the research results, a mix of young women, some of whom could probably get considerable profit, are getting considerable profit out of the fact that it is a women's college exclusively, others of whom are of the sort for whom that doesn't so much matter. They would also be getting about the same benefits on a coeducational campus. That mix, I think, is characteristic of what we have in women's colleges now, and it is in its way a good mix and presents a wide and exciting and interesting spectrum of students to work with.

As more women's colleges go coeducational or in general as coeducation becomes the thing, is it going to be true that the mix is going to be not so mixed in those colleges which remain women's colleges? Are they, in short, going to attract and have a more special segment of college women, namely, those who, yes, would most benefit by being at a women's college but who do not as well represent the whole spectrum of young womanhood? I don't know. I really don't know.

Of course I don't know, but it seems to me enormously important that we find out what happens, because what we do in the future can be done sensibly only if we know what actually is going on and, therefore, my general passion is that from here out we take some pains to research carefully what is happening in this sector of the educational world which is staying non-coeducational, on the fence, or going coeducational, because I think it is a pretty special sector in which our whole conception of what goes on is not going to last very long. It will have to be replaced by new knowledge about what actually happens from here out.

I will limit myself to that and one other thing. The other thing is that with respect to the education of women, as with respect to education generally, those of us who have had any great interest in educational research would, I am sure, continue to urge that we have all too little knowledge about the following: Every college says that it is trying to fit its procedures and curriculum and philosophy to the needs of the kind of students that it has, and as has come out richly in this conference, a very strong justification for the women's college is that it is a college that is conscious of, dedicated to ministering to the particular needs of women, and in a general statistical way, sociological way, broadly social-psychological way, we know what the general needs of women may be or we can mark them out from those of men; but I do feel that in this field we need much more research of a case study sort of concrete human beings, individual human beings, that marks out what in fact were their needs, what in fact was the college's meeting and non-meeting of those needs as they were in college, and studies of individual alumnae to find out what this all looks like in retrospect to them and in relation to the concretenesses of their later life.

I would urge very much that a good deal of this is needed, I think, to bring concreteness into the -- I don't mean to say pious things we say because I think we are being more than pious about that and about the education of women; we are being really determined about it; but to bring concreteness into those generalities of serving the feminine need, and so on, that we, of course, are dedicated to.

We ought to be dedicated to it even after we go coeducational, of course. Vassar, I hope, is going to be continuously interested in the education of women. It is also taking on an interest in the education of men.

So, it seems to me that it would be very easy to run out of, as Mrs. Rossi has pointed out, the kinds of things that we could draw on such as existent research, gather little nuggets of gold there, but ye gods, what we need to do in the future is very pressing, I think, and it won't get done unless we are pretty determined to do it. You know how colleges are about instituting and using research on themselves. They like to research other things but they are always a little queasy and always a little lazy about researching themselves. I urge that the colleges represented here had better not be.

APPENDIX II

PRESENTATIONS BY ALICE S. ROSSI

Wednesday Morning Session, July 9, 1969

Before I get to the major business that I want to address myself to this morning, namely, to report the research that I have been doing on women college graduates, I wonder if you would indulge me by letting me introduce something that provides a link to this morning. One question was raised as to whether in this period of shifting sands where everything seems to be moving under our feet so fast and we haven't done the proper research, there isn't some hard data that people in education could turn to to provide some ballast against this tide of change.

I would submit that my field and the behavioral sciences have been overrepresented on the board of resource persons that have been asked to address you. We are in the soft field -- sociology and psychology. There are, however, unrepresented fields that can provide you with some very hard data, full of implications as far as what the future of women's colleges is going to be and, in particular, what the future is of all private liberal arts colleges, not just women's colleges.

I assume in my view of the future that private institutions will all be co-ed within the next thirty years, and by way of providing one example of the hard kind of data, this from the field of those like Seymour Harris and Mr. Tipton who were involved in the Conferences on Education, and particularly concern for the economics of higher education, to just remind you of what the current projections are of enrollment and of the proportion of total college enrollment that is going to be represented by private institutions.

I just very briefly sketched this on the board. We are now at a point here of about 6 million youngsters being in higher education and have, as you see, undergone this revolution in higher education. But what is most interesting and I think full of implications from many points of view for the goals of the students and particularly from the fiscal point of view, is this declining proportion that private institutions represent of total enrollment.

Seymour Harris, in looking at this figure, says what? He says that within the next fifteen years the private institution will have an increasing number of the persons they go to for funds to support their private institutions asking them: What is special about a private institution that isn't taken care of by a public institution? That question will increase in frequency for the reason that more and more people who are potential donors are then, themselves, the products of public education; so that this question of what is going to happen is one of the hard kinds of facts and I think we should take a figure like that and run with it in our discussions.

That also means that we are reaching very quickly a period of relative stability in projected enrollment. We are in that period of change right now, but there is stability ahead even though the total enrollment is going up.

There is one other example of that kind of hard factor that is setting the kind of parameters of the future for us that we know will not change because they are a reflection of the life process, and a very good example here is the following: If you have a fluctuation in the birth rate, you have got differential size cohorts moving through the life space, so that as an example, if we think in 1969 a woman who is two years out of college is now 23, she is at the peak marriage years. When was she born? She was born in 1946. Well, whom do women marry? They tend to marry men their own age or a few years older. For that woman today, a man two years older was born in 1944 but the birth rate between 1944 and 1946 was like this (gesturing), so that there are fewer potential mates of the traditional pool that would be the mate for the younger woman, and this means that there is a marriage squeeze on that particular cohort and women who postpone marriage now are in for an increasing squeeze over the next few years. But that is the kind of hard fact from demography that all too many people, even in my own field of the behavioral sciences, much less reaching out to a broader field of educators, seldom concern themselves with.

So much for the transition. My job in terms of reporting to you today was to report on a very complex piece of research that I have been affiliated with, and the problem is now to report it to you in a very brief period of time and still give you a sense of the complexity of the study and not just report the trees and not permit you to share with me a view of the forest.

I have to, in order for the results to be meaningful, backstep a bit and describe the context within which this work was done, because it sets the parameters of what I was able to do. This is a study of women college graduates of one particular cohort. They are the graduates who were interviewed when I joined this study three years post-college. It is a longitudinal study that may be familiar to many of you because two volumes have been published now by James Davis that deal with the same cohort -- "The Great Aspirations in Undergraduate Career Decisions."

This is a study that was financed at the peak of the post-Sputnik concern for manpower as a result of discussions within government on trying to predict what would be the available manpower at projected periods in the future in very special fields. They wanted to know how many astrophysicists there would be in the mid-1970's. One way of getting at that is to look at the career choices of persons while they are in college and then follow them through and see what happens to them in the implementation of those career goal choices.

The interest in certain specialties predetermined the fact that this had to be a massive research operation, so that the study consists of some 35,000 graduates of the class of 1961 who were first contacted as seniors and then contacted each year for three years following with, I understand, one sub-sample contacted within the last two years.

The prior commitment of the project being on career choice is a perfect example of what one gentleman this morning asked about whether there wasn't a male model implicit in all work in this field, because the design of the study assumed that if you got the field a person was moving into retrospectively as a freshman, watched what happened by senior, and then followed him through the process of early job experience and higher education post-college, they would have a net of variability that would account for the choice of the career and would account primarily for what happened in the process of implementation.

By three years after graduation from college, for the first time the study directors faced the fact that they could predict that at least half -- they didn't know quite how much but at least half -- of the women in the sample would be married, and that the implications of this for what they were doing in terms of employment, in terms of higher education, was quite different from the implications for marriage for a male graduate.

I happened to be on the scene because my husband was the Director of the Research Center that this was taking place in and I had working relationships privately with a few of the study directors and was able to convince them that if they wanted even to do an adequate analysis of the career choice of the women, they simply had to widen and broaden the study's time dimension at both ends. That is to say, I hypothesized that the variables that would be most influential as predictors of field choice or career salience would be factored about the life experience of the women that lay far back in time before they ever entered college, and I was given permission to design a special instrument that would go only to the women as a supplement to the basic design of the study. This meant that the women that third year post-college received a 44-page schedule and the men in the sample received a 23-page schedule, the first 23 pages being identical for the sexes so that we had data on both, the same data on both, and then additional data on the women.

My colleagues were convinced that, faced with a 44-page document, the women would not respond and what I would do would be to seriously disturb the response rate. I argued that the women would be so pleased that finally someone got around to a sensitive appreciation of the factors that were unique to them that there would be no sex difference in response rate. That was a wild hope on my part and we therefore fielded a pre-test of some 900 cases and found in the pre-test that not only was the sex response rate the same, but I kept getting telephone calls long distance and letters saying, "I have about ten friends who would love to fill out your questionnaire. Would you send ten more copies?" So, my hope was justified at least in that sense.

The design in the instrument for the women is based on certain assumptions and I would like to lay those out very briefly. I must admit that this is now five years later and I am a student, not only a researcher, and my ideas have changed as fast as I have been analyzing the data, but I have to go back in time and tell you what my hypotheses were at the time I designed the study.

My concern was primarily with the high aspiring woman who was almost like a man, whom we have been hearing about this morning. I was concerned really for differentiation among women and how to account for it. I wanted to know: How did a woman who was headed for medical school or law school education, or who was headed for a doctorate, differ from the women who were satisfied with a terminal B.A., who saw themselves as having employment at some time in their life but not with that burning sense of commitment that might characterize those who were seeking the higher degree.

Therefore, the broader sociological framework was that this was a study of role deviance -- I don't mean "deviance" in a pejorative sense but in a sense of marginality, in the sense that for an American woman at this time in our history to make the choice to go for an M.D. or a law degree or a Ph.D. is to make a deviant choice in terms of the cultural modality of what is considered appropriate for women and by women.

Further, in terms of specifications, I made the further assumption that all adult deviant role choices will be rooted in deviant experiences or characteristics of the past. That is the sense in which I opened up retrospectively to try to find information about what was happening to them as they were growing up. I had to make that assumption. I had to try to decide what would be some of the critical variables that would trigger a woman's going off during the high school years from the family of origin she came from, that would lead her headed post-college toward a high similar-to-male career style vs. someone who was not even envisioning any employment post-college, and I put my bets on two areas, primarily.

One had to do with the whole psychosexual development of the girl, and here it is curious that I, faced with a study that had to lean primarily on written questionnaire material, wanted to build in a variable that could very easily have been built into many of the studies that have been conducted in women's colleges, in Vassar, in Bennington, etc., and that is that it must make a difference in American culture what a woman looks like, how attractive she considers herself to be to the opposite sex, and what her whole heterosexual development was. My hunch was that variation in this area would have played a very important role in the unfolding of her goals as she entered college.

Second, I was concerned for the primary influence of the family of origin upon the goals that the women set for themselves and here, although in psychology we have talked a great deal about the influence of mothers on their children when they are 2, 3, 5, 6, but not on young adults.

If the maternal influence is really a very salient thing, it must have long-range implications that you can still trace when a woman is grown. So, therefore, I was interested in getting a good deal of information about the family in terms of each individual member of the family.

I asked, for example, the women to rate the relationship they had with their mothers, with their fathers, with each of their siblings; what the relationship was between their parents; and then a very great deal of detail on exactly what the mother did with her life: not merely did she work or did she not work, but when did she work, how persistently, what was her attitude toward her employment, what was her education, what success did she experience.

Here the hunch was that since this was a very large sample of 15,000 women, I would catch in that big net a little deviant group that I was especially interested in, namely, the daughters whose mothers were college-educated, professional, employed persistently through their lifetime, and that the daughter reports that the mother had some particular success in her work, either by way of being well known in her field or having won awards.

I was able to catch 600 such cases and, therefore, could look at the question: Is there any generational transmission in that mother-daughter relationship that left its mark on the girl, the daughter's feeling about herself and the direction she sees herself moving in her own adult life?

This is the general background to what I was after. From that, I had several quite specific hypotheses. To begin with, I was arguing that ambition, any characteristic of ambition in a male in American society has only one channel, and that is the occupational system. For a woman to be ambitious, to be self-assertive and competitive, has at least three: She can seek and obtain status in marriage to a high-status male; she can vicariously channel her own ambition to the rearing of accomplished children; or she can attempt something in terms of her own accomplishment.

Second, that despite the rosy kind of talk that has been taking place in the post-Sputnik period about the possibility of there no longer being a conflict between family role salience and career role salience, I predicted that there would be a negative relationship between any measure or measures of family role salience and career role salience. In other words, I predicted that the high career-committed women would show a deviant profile on their family role commitment; more specifically, that the career-committed women would be less apt to be involved in the world of family and kin; that they would be more apt to postpone marriage; that they would want fewer children or no children; that they would be more unconventional, agnostic, atheistic, on the assumption that religion is a tradition inducer in women in terms of the life style for women; and that they would be more willing to let others handle the care of their home and the care of their children.

I argued further that this negative relationship between these two spheres would not be a matter of rational choice--that is to say, that since you want to go for a career you decide that you will adapt, anticipating the complexity of that role combination, that you would reduce your anticipated involvement in family in order to make this a possible thing; and predicted, instead, that the lower family role salience of the woman would be what, in turn, is the product of a very different experience in the family of origin.

Turning to the results, I guess in one sense I wouldn't be here if my hypotheses weren't confirmed, so you can predict what I am going to say. I thought I might just inject a few words about the general modal profile of these women college graduates which might have some interest to you since most of you come from private institutions in which, as I read Mr. Wilson's data on class background of students, for example, in the past, correcting in light of what Dr. Fleming was saying before -- that something like between 6 and 9 percent of the women in the seventy-six colleges came from families in which the father was either a farmer or a low-skilled blue collar worker -- that figure was farming plus working class blue collar occupations. In a national sample of the kind that I am dealing with, we have a very much more heterogeneous group of women and 38 percent of these graduates came from families in which the father was either a low white collar skill or a blue collar worker, and another 8 percent from farm families, so that is 46 percent of them, a very solid representation that is underrepresented in the colleges that you represent.

Further anticipating the direction of some of the analysis, half of their mothers have never worked since they were born and only a minority, something like 10 percent, had worked since the daughter was a pre-schooler. These are the mothers who are in that generation which is involved in the great bulge now among middle-aged women in the labor force, since the mothers in this sample would be women in their late forties and early fifties.

I looked into the comments on the mothers' employment, because there has been so much from the econometricians' analysis of the female labor force, something that was not done until the economists realized that women were here to stay, perhaps, in the labor force and therefore they had to pay attention to them; so some of the very best analysis that has been done on female labor force participation has been done by economists, by Glen Chaim, in particular, and in his analysis there were three major correlates of married women's employment: One was the presence of any children -- presence/absence -- or the number of children; and the third was any measure of marital instability. Women who are unhappy in marriage, women who are separated, divorced, widowed, are far more apt to be in the labor force than those who are married and happily married.

I looked into this whole question, therefore, of what I knew about the families of origin in those cases where the mothers were employed and where they were not employed, and I indeed found the following sort of syndrome: that where the mother was working, there was less apt to have been a happy parental marriage -- mind you, these are all ratings by the daughter. She was asked to rate her parents' relationship on a continuum that spread from very tense and strained to very close and intimate.

There were more ratings of the mother being the very dominant person and the father not being dominant. There was more tension in the relationship between the daughter and her mother and the daughter and her father; but for the modal profile, most of the mothers of these young women were at home. The family relationships were close and intimate ones. The daughter was more apt to have been the oldest or the only child. The predominant profile was for the father to have been dominant and the mother not, or both parents seen as being dominant.

By three years after college, there were three patterns of activity that accounted for some 70 percent of the women. They were either single and working; they were married, childless and were working; or they were married with a child and were at home. The number of triple role combiners, namely, being married with a child, going to graduate school and holding a job is something like one percent despite some of the fancy articles that appear in Sunday supplements about women combining all these things.

In terms of heterosexual development, I started with age of menses for a very specific reason, and that is the hunch that I needed some crude though it be indicator of what triggers the heterosexual profile in terms of social behavior that I was going to pick up, and since I knew from studies of physical growth and maturation that the age of menses has been dropping dramatically over the last fifty years, one hypothesis I had was that part of what has been involved in the dropping of the age at marriage is that the beginning of sexual maturation was starting earlier, so that the period of time between the onset of menses and marriage may be relatively constant going through time but what you have had is dropping of the age of marriage because and maybe ten years before there was the beginning of a development sexually.

In this sample, the modal age was 13, but with an extremely interesting range from under 9 to 16 still being shown: Modal age of dating was 14, going steady by 16.

One of the things I had to correct in the pre-test was to up the categories on dating frequency during high school and college. I had as a category once or more a week, and found that most of my students were in that end category in terms of dating frequency, and to get any variation I had to up it to dating three or more times a week, and in spite of doing that, this turned out on the national sample to be the modal category.

In terms of where they see themselves going in the future, 75 percent or more of the women are headed for heavily feminine fields, with less than 8 percent entering all of the professions that you identify as being predominantly masculine. The major change between college senior and three years post-college is an increase in the proportion choosing homemaker as a long-range goal. No other choice pattern shows as great a change -- that is, shifting from aspiring to be a biologist and ending up as a business executive, or from engineering to business, etc. No increase was as great as this increase from any field to homemaker.

As college seniors, there were only 8 percent who sai homemaking was the long-range career goal, whereas by thre years after college that had jumped to 20. I suspect it has gone up even further since then as the bite of reality begins to take its toll.

Despite this, there are some two-thirds of the sample who expect to get some degree past college, but only a third of them have done anything about it. I did look into what differentiates among those who say they are going for a higher degree, what differentiates the women who do something about it right away vs. those who started for a while and then interrupted; and, thirdly, those who have postponed it completely. It is a goal in the future but they are not doing anything about it.

Based on expectations from the literature, one would think that it was marital status and maternity status that would be the exclusive differentiating factor between these three types. This isn't completely the case. All the self-ratings that the women gave, particularly on one measure I called high drive -- that is to say, women who tended to see themselves as dominant, as socially and occupationally competitive, as talkative, were women who did something about that educational goal and they were overrepresented among those who immediately went into higher education.

The postponers tended to be relatively low on that, raising a question of whether that isn't merely just a perpetuation of the value that came through during their college year, that there can't be anything better than having ever more and more education.

Of these women in terms of their degree expectations, there are only 7 percent who were aspiring to the Ph.D. That had been 11 percent when they were college seniors. In other words, some three-quarters of the women who aspired for a Ph.D. held the same degree goal when they were college seniors but there were twice as many who dropped the aspiration for the degree as there were who gained it during those intervening years.

With only 7 percent expecting that degree, and Mr. Wilson's table that he showed you this morning showing something like 11 percent of the doctorates granted being to women, this 7 percent, even if you change it around and take it as the proportion of females aspiring for the Ph.D., is still very small in the sample. There are a lot of returnees, people who would not be caught in an age cohort who come back into higher education and have gained the degree aspiration of the doctorate that I can't catch in this sample.

In terms of what they were expecting to do with themselves in the future as far as employment is concerned, a third expected no work at all after the birth of a first child; only some 18 percent expected to be persistently employed through the family cycle, just with minor, short withdrawals along the way.

In the deeper analysis of the interrelationships among variables, I pick off the cream of some of the lines of analysis that I pursued in the results that looked like this: There is indeed a strong negative relationship between anticipated family role salience and career role salience. Women with high career aspirations by three years after college are less apt to be married. For example, of the women aspiring for the Ph.D., 55 percent are still single whereas only a third are still single in the total sample.

They are more apt to postpone child rearing if they are married; they want fewer children; they are more willing to let others care for their child; they are less apt to enjoy any domestic activity -- and this involved a long list of some twelve things one does as a homemaker, asking them to rate their enjoyment of them.

They are more apt to be unconventional; that is to say that jobs, so far as the majority are concerned, are accepted by the majority of the graduates but a career in the sense of a burning commitment in the sense that Melvin talks of "this hostile necessity to write," is a very minor and deviant pattern.

Nor is there a rational choice adaptation. If it were, that is to say, if the depression of involvement in family roles was a rational choice of function and adapted to facilitate their own career development, then one would not expect to find any statistical relationship between family role salience and the background indicated that intuitively, or based on psychological theory, one would predict would show a relationship; but in point of fact, the predictors of low family role involvement cluster in the following way: Families in which the mothers were rated as dominant more often than the fathers, working class rather than middle class (I am now listing those variables that predicted this cluster of low family role-high career); to have had tense, strained relations with the mother rather than close, intimate ones, with a minor variation that if there were successful professional mothers rather than satisfied homemaker mothers, this triggered a depression of family involvement and a heightening of the daughter's career commitment.

One minor variation that is interesting; because it is similar to the study reported last night by the Plancks on women mathematicians, is that one sub-type in which you find three times as large a proportion of women seeking the doctorate as you do in the general sample, is a family situation in which there is closeness to the father and tension with the mother, which was interesting; those mothers who had greater educational attainment than the father or mothers regretted that they had not had training for a career. The daughters in such a situation tend to be low family-high career people.

On the heterosexual development, these women tended to date later, to date less frequently, and more of them are still not married.

Their self-ratings are ambitious, dominant, competitive, unconventional, agnostic. If married (as I mentioned last night), these are not the wives of executives or ministers or engineers so much as they are the wives of men who either have or are working toward a doctorate in the arts and humanities and depending on the career fiel of the woman. If she is in sciences, then there is a heightening of the husbands who are seeking science degres.

Currently, these women are undergoing reality shock I have another chance tomorrow morning so I will save th implications and stay with the research, because I did want to have a chance to describe some of what I think is going on in the post-college years.

It was only from intensive interviewing with women to counter this focus just on the numbers and looking at statistical tables, which are fine but are no substitute for interviewing some of them in the flesh, that I reached some of these conclusions. I interviewed a number of women in Chicago at the Medical School and the Law School as well as doctorate seekers, and then even trying to get some contact with some homemaker type women, took advantage of a graduate student wives' club on the night that they were having a local florist come to describe floral arrangements. I went and made some contacts and got some intensive interviews with women who saw themselves in quite traditional terms.

What analysis of this data from the quantitative and the qualitative material suggested to me was that we have tended to think about the whole life having a cycle and we talk about the innocence of childhood, the stages of man, and there is indeed a whole field now of human development that is concerned with the processes of change through the life cycle.

But what I had not thought to think out in advance was that a role has a cycle too, and this was to me an illuminating thing, to look at the probable curve of affect or satisfaction, comparing across roles.

If I could read first one quote from a woman who three years after college said this about herself:

> "With three babies under 16 months to care for since I left college, and a husband madly working day and night on his Ph.D., several outside obligations, I find discussions of careers increasingly remote. I have tried to answer the questions about the job truthfully but right now I am concentrating on guiding my babies through the perils of infancy. Someday I may want to return to academic circles.

> "Also, I would like to pursue my painting as far as I am capable of taking it, but if I discover that painting can fulfill me I may give up the job idea. It will all depend. But right now don't ask me about jobs. Just pass the diapers, the bottles and pablum."

Now, the area of uncertainty that you can see in that is the area of the career role, and she is fully launched in a very high demand and very satisfactory stage of both her marriage and her maternal role. If you might think in terms of where they are at now in their twenties, then look ahead to what might happen in the thirties and then in their forties and older, what I would suggest -- and this dimension is going to be some measure of satisfaction in role -- is that family roles, by their very nature, have high early peaks of satisfaction -- the honeymoon, the first year after marriage, the pregnancy, particularly with that first child, and the first year.

But what we know from any studies that look at marital satisfaction by duration of marriage -- and, unfortunately the behavioral scientists have never thought to inquire, maybe because they don't want to face the fact that parenthood is not necessarily all bliss -- they have never thought to ask, How does satisfaction with being a parent vary through time with the age of the child? I would predict that that has a curve of ascent to a very high early peak and then a leveling off, and that is consistent with what we know from studies like Goren, who looked at marital duration with satisfaction; but that a career role, by its very nature because of the long training involved, particularly for those women who are seeking deviant things in American society, has a long period here and then it reaches a peak, a level like that (at blackboard).

When I study women in their mid-twenties, the women who are married and headed for the homemaker role look like not only very busy women but very happy women, and these women who are headed for a career are having quite another experience.

If I could shift out of my field to just quote three lines from a poem by Randall Jerroll about women, it describes so well that transition period for the traditional woman:

> "And yet how quickly the bride's veils evaporate,
> A girl hesitates a moment in mid air
> And settles to the ground a wife, a mother."

But if a woman is headed for an M.D., she doesn't hesitate in mid air just a few moments and when she settles to the ground it is a pretty bumpy one. In other words, there is a long phase like that (referring to drawing) and to illustrate the area of uncertainty for that woman who is headed for a career, let me just quote one woman who is in medical school:

> "I have enjoyed my medical education immensely and have developed good relationships on a friendly basis with my male classmates. I have never dated one of them and the experience of the other girls in my class has been similar. Our 'excessive education' and the closeness of our medical school community along with the availability of a school of nursing nearby makes us less socially desirable than the nonprofessional women in the community.
>
> "Perhaps the men feel unable to relax as easily with us, as though the somewhat competitive professional situation must be extended to after-hour relations with us. Whatever the reason, they tend to avoid us as lovers or spouses and the limitation which professional activities impose on outside social life -- no time to meet people outside the medical center -- puts us women in a bind. In addition, there are fewer outlets for expression of our tensions and agression than are available to our male colleagues, and for those of us who have domestic impulses and want a stable, contented homelife, the rigors of a professional routine with its requirements for efficiency and unemotional behavior contribute a great strain

and make life somewhat arid and unrewarding."

Here in this case, the area of uncertainty has to do with what is going to happen to her in her female side, in the possibility of marriage, and her satisfaction is building.

Now, there is a further factor that I think might trigger that kind of reversal and that is that the assumption of a marital goal, although in a marriage system that can only be characterized as a serial monogamous system -- that is, you can have more than one spouse but you can't have them at the same time, just in sequence -- despite that, marriage is a commitment that tends to persist and once you have a child you can't have an ex-child, or through separation and divorce, to change that. But the career line, the work role, has built into it the possibility of retaining that peak, to give up one job and take on another, and you might through that process retain a relatively high level of satisfaction in the work role.

Turning perhaps to a last example of the kinds of material that come from the study to the family of origin itself, the most prevalent situation that produces a daughter with very high career salience and an expectation that she will be employed is, therefore, the following: a mother who worked steadily, was dominant but the father not, and a close relationship between the mother and the daughter, particularly if that mother was a college graduate and professionally successful person. These daughters are themselves most apt to seek a higher degree and they show elevated levels of self-confidence and are themselves more dominant and assertive, they show less domestic enjoyment, but they are not entering masculine fields. Rather, like their mothers, they are entering feminine fields but with more comfort.

I think this is interesting because there is a basic irony involved: That is, the women who are going for a Ph.D. in science, for example, are more apt to be women who had a close relationship with their dominant father and a homemaker mother. They overchoose masculine professions in that sense, but they have other personal characteristics that lead to a lower level of self-assertion and competitiveness. In other words, in the very fields where they would most benefit by having personal characteristics of confidence and assertion, namely, the masculine fields, these are women who are lower in it, whereas the women who have professionally successful mothers with whom they had very good relations are entering fields that are not as competitive; they are entering the feminine fields. This may be the route that leads to the women who head up a surgical nursing or school administrators or, if I may be forgiven, the head of a convent.

Only under unusual circumstances though, can those who start with a lower level of assertiveness and confidence in self build up that confidence through the route of the work role itself in adulthood, but I think this is important to stress that this can take place because the whole pressure of influence of psychology upon the thinking of sociologists is to have bought the line that there is very little you can do beyond a certain age, that all the formative influences are done with and the schools can't do anything and an individual can't do anything.

This was the dilemma when I reached a certain point in the analysis of the data. It distressed me no end and I had to confront the fact that I privately was betting against myself. I was betting against my design. I was hoping, despite the very good social reasons, the thinking that there would be a negative relationship between family role commitment and career role commitment, that I would find that, in fact, there was not because I wanted to believe that women could do this. But, I think part of the reason for the pessimism was because I, like others of my generation, have in whatever psychological training they have had in the past, overly accepted and overly bought that school of psychology which is felt to be most relevant to our work, and that tended to be the psychology that was looking for stable traits in people, that was concerned for personality theories, and goodness knows anyone concerned for the status of women in the last decade had had it really up to here about fulfillment and identity and searching for the self, etc., almost ad nauseum, and has not looked hard at what other sides of psychology say about the adequacy of the work done in the areas of personality and role theory.

If there is any one piece of reading I would add to the bibliography that we were provided with here, it is a chapter by Walter Michel, which appeared in a volume on "The Psychology of Sex Differences" that Eleanor McAbee put out a few years ago because here when you start, as Michel does, with the social learning theory of human development, you have to reassess what we have taken for granted from the older tradition in psychology, because what comes out from the hardest kind of experimental data as he reviews it is an old sociological assumption that as sociologists turned empirical, they never really adequately tested, and that is that who a person is is socially defined in the situation the person is in, and if I can refer to just one kind, one experiment that suggests the influence of the social definition of a situation better than any I know, it would be the study by Schachter and Singer.

This is a study, an experimental study, in which the subjects were injected with adrenalin. An adrenalin injection tends to produce a state of physiological arousal that is very close to what people feel when they are afraid. We talk about adrenalin increase in situations of fright. The subjects were divided into two groups. One group after the injection went into a room in which there was a stooge who was acting in a certain way. In the one room he was acting very happy and euphoric. In the other room, the stooge acted very angry and fearful and afraid, and the person with the injection acted as the stooge acted, despite the fact that they had in their body something that would trigger only the one response and not certainly euphoria and pleasure.

It is this kind of material that encouraged me to report these data and still not feel abysmally pessimistic about the chances of what can happen in a college environment.

Despite the fact that maternal influence is strong, despite the fact that these past experiences are something that the college cannot change, what is happening in the social situation confronted by the woman when she reaches out? Are their male faculties relating to them as serious persons or only as future housewives? One of my future colleagues told me the other night that she overheard one of her male colleagues saying to a student who was in tears as the result of a test, "Don't be so upset. Just think, you will only be dealing with dishes three years from now."

Are the women faculty willing to deal with the private feelings of their students and to design courses appropriate to those students that get away from the homey-mealy of cognitive muscles?

If we are really concerned with the development of the uniqueness of an individual, it is not by some broad panoramic, comprehensive sweep of man's western history through the head but it has got to have education that is translated down into the introspective sensibilities of the student, into giving them experiences in trying out real life situations, because that is the route whereby values and goals are changed and no amount of talking from a lectern will ever do it.

I had a lot more I wanted to say, but let me just end with the following, although I am very hard pushed to say exactly how this is a consequence of my research and analysis. When we talk constantly about more research -- we want more research -- that is true and it answers some questions, but there is a lot of just hard thinking and a hard review of our own values that I think would be a lot more relevant, even, than the research results in terms of deciding where should education go in the private liberal arts colleges. That is to encourage a view that is best expressed, to my knowledge, in Tennyson's little essay on "Faith is in the Lecture Hall," in calling, in higher education, for "a friendly culture in which individuals can try to become whole and integrated men and women who have not only educated minds but a developed ethical sense and a sensitive, emotional life in both their personal and their public roles."

This is a long cry from much of what we have been hearing in the area of trying to improve the opportunities of women in higher education, which I think has been very much how to get women into science, how to get women into technology, how to get more women into medicine. I think there will be more women in these fields after some of the goals of those fields have been changed, and that perhaps what this society needs -- and now I am taking a very long step from any of the data -- is not more scientists and engineers but more persons of sensibility and understanding and willingness to engage directly with the problems that face our society; that rather than changing some of the characteristics of women, we have to think in the direction of counteracting those things that have landed us in a situation where we uncritically accept that all progress is good, that the higher the rate of technological growth and development, the better we are, when in fact it might mean the worse we are.

Thursday Morning Session, July 10, 1969

Some of these are not really completely research questions because I have them woven together within a larger statement, but I will skip through and pull some out that do seem to have research and experimentation implications.

The first, and I think one very basic, question that I have been listening for an answer to for the last couple of days has to do with the following. We have been talking as if there is a dichotomy, there is either a coeducational institution or there is a women's college institution, and I don't think it is a dichotomy. When does a women's college stop being a women's college -- when it has one man, fifty? What proportion of the student body has to be male in order for a women's college to slip into the category of a coeducational institution? Is Vassar now a co-ed because you have fifty visiting students? Do you have to be fully taking all your work in one institution?

I think one of the points that might be quite relevant to make in any statement we make is to disturb the assumption of this dichotomy, because as we have coordinate campuses people may be residentially in a women's college and an all-male college, but if there is cross-registration it is no longer a women's college and a men's college. The education is then coeducational and the residential is unisex. I think this is one question that we should attempt to clarify.

The second is, I think there are some very hard economic analysis studies that need to be done, not along the lines that we heard criticized by calling in a business consultation firm to assess the total institution but to pose substantive and philosophically relevant questions to an economic consultant, to try to make some assessments of cost in the framework of long-range planning of an institution where we raise such questions to such a consultant as: What, exactly, is the economic feasibility of a coordinate cluster college patterned along the lines that Mr. Sexton has begun to criticize in the sense that if you have five colleges you have five administrators and it tends to proliferate more administrative posts, increasing the cost of the education.

What are the implications in terms of cost-cutting of shifting from a nine-month year, five days a week, to opening your campus and really using those facilities either for just your own students or adding special categories of students to keep the plant working all year round, including Saturdays, having evening classes, turning the campus over in the summer? What is the contribution to the operating budget of an institution; for what purposes might the college campus be used in the summer?

These are quite specific questions which I think an economist would be able to give some answers to, and if you could earn some money by other uses of the campus, that could be fed into some of the experimental work of the undergraduate women which involves the innovative look, more intensive use of staff, and this might certainly be something worth pursuing.

Third, in terms of research I think we need more knowledge, not about students so much but about faculty. Mr. Chinoy mentioned this yesterday in raising the question of what brings men to a women's college faculty and what keeps them there? Why do they stay?

Similarly, what is the difference between men and women on the faculty of a women's college and what, indeed, happens to the woman who is now going to a previously all-male institution in contrast to what might have happened to her in a women's college?

I would raise the question, for example, in this context of what proportion of the faculty at a women's undergraduate college are there with a sense of personal failure that they "didn't make it" in the big league of the university departments they earned their degrees in and as a result find a particular individual psychic significance to the kind of control they have over curriculum, over student life, over the production of that 1 out of 7 percent mentioned yesterday as a kind of compensatory fulfillment of their own early frustrated career goals. The reaction to challenge from students is often so excessively like a proud and self-righteously preening peacock out of all proportion to the issue that I sometimes suspect there is some ego and status threat to the undergraduate faculty.

Another question in connection with faculty is faculty attitude toward class size. I suspected in coming that we would have some discussion of class size beyond the invocation of the platitude that one of the justifications for a small college is the advantages of a small class, independent study work, seminar work, and I would raise the question of how valid this claim is. This has been used as a justification for keeping the size of a college down, despite the fact that when a college like Amherst looked at outside classroom contacts between their faculty and their students, they found that 80 percent of the contacts out of the classroom were enjoyed by 20 percent of the students, and the students who enjoyed that contact were the big men on campus, and on the basis of that decided there was no justification for holding down enrollment and increased it by a goodly number.

The same question can be asked about small colleges or small classes: Why are small classes preferred? Beyond a small seminar, which for certain topics is certainly better than a large class, but beyond, say, thirty students in a class, does it really make any difference if there are 150? Is it perhaps a justification for a hiding of a lack of preparation on the part of some faculty members to prefer the small class? I would submit that one does not enter a lecture hall of 150 without excellent preparation in a way that you might be a little more willing to enter a small class, picking up something from the morning newspaper and having a discussion about it.

One of the problems here in terms of some of the resistance of faculty to large classes is that it increases their work, and I think, administratively, one can be imaginative in meeting that. For example, if there was a subject that was appropriate and a faculty person who felt comfortable in that situation of a large class, why have that instructor be given the credit for one course? Why not, if it is a very large class, let that be the equivalent of two courses in which the faculty members could offer two lectures a week and then break it up into sections and meet half the class twice a week? If there were credit for this being the equivalent of two courses, there might be much more willingness on the part of faculty to handle a large-sized class.

Of course, it is the case that not all faculty and not all students would lend themselves to the use of large lecture series, but if we should be looking for diversity among faculty, and faculty probably do vary in their feelings along this line. For example, I suspect that there are some faculty members in the colleges who are scared to death of independent study and feel much more comfortable in a group situation rather than facing one student across a desk and designing a very specialized program of study for that one student.

So, maybe not only should we open up this idea of class size and diversity but we might even apply that on a departmental level. Perhaps (and this is just a hunch), a department might benefit by having a diversity of types within it, so that you had the researcher scholar who was a loner and didn't like big contacts and wanted to spend most of her time with students in internships or independent study; there might be another sort of charismatic type of teacher who is able to reach students at all levels; or a generalist who likes to bridge interstices between fields and should be encouraged to experiment in that direction; or someone innovative who likes to teach in order to learn a new area along the lines we were talking about yesterday.

Now, here I begin to get very fuzzy between what is research and what is just research-action combination, an attempt at an experimental program, but another is to raise the question of what exactly does faculty do as advisors to students, and what is the range of variation among the faculty members? Should faculty be trained in some kind of campus life, particularly if they are in fields that have given them no professional background in techniques or in counseling?

Particularly from my experience where women faculty in women's colleges are concerned, I would raise the question as to how willing that faculty is to go beyond the role of honing the cognitive skills of their students. I have been appalled at several institutions to find that women psychologists on the faculty tried almost purposely to make psychology so formidable an experimental and methodological science that they fended off students who came to the subject of psychology with questions about their own personality, their own sexual drives, and the teacher pushes them away and is defining this as irrelevant to the subject of the course, although that is the motivational basis with which the student came; so that they are working against the student rather than with the student, and one would want to know, if one were doing research on faculty, how prevalent this is and what are some of the reasons for it, and what one can do about it.

Another, and still in the category of potential lines of inquiry, of thought or research about faculty, is the question of how cooperative or how resistant would the stable, permanent core of faculty be compared to student responses to inviting visiting part-time or permanent faculty members who don't have the typical academic credentials of the Ph.D. or almost Ph.D., but people who have a wealth of practical experience in problems in the world, in urban planning, in public and welfare administration, in museum or stage or creative writing, fields of this sort?

And last, and as an example of starting with a research finding that Mr. Chapman reported, I would like just to trace out in terms of what is the college doing about it and what might be an alternative. That is, one of the sex differences that was reported is a tendency on the part of girls to prefer more of a flat plateau of performance, whereas boys are willing to get the C's in exchange for really giving their all to some particular area of interest. What happens in women's colleges? What do you do with women students? Do you accept this tendency or delight in it, is it part of your reward sanction system to give approval for the high performance? What happens if you have a student who really wants to go out with this burning commitment to one subject and is getting poor grades in another? Do you punish her in terms of love withholdal, approval withholdal, or is she given some recognition for the fact that this might be precisely the behavior that leads to a commitment of some significance and, therefore, eventual contribution to that field of inquiry?

What can you do about this? Let's examine your honors list. What is the basis of it? Is it possible for a woman student to be given honors for some outstanding performance in one subject even if she has had a mediocre performance in others, or does she have to be superb in all areas or a plateau profile that puts her right over the line of some grade point average?

I have a special reason for raising this question because I think it has important implications for the later ability of women as adults to have flexibility in the combination of their roles. That is, this same plateau phenomenon, the tendency of wanting to do very well in all areas, I think paves the way for what some of us have observed among older women, and that is the feeling that they must be performing at a level in all of their roles simultaneously; that a woman has to keep a perfectly managed household, be available and responsive to each child's needs when the child wants it; a perfect hostess; a good community organizer and volunteer, a PTA and a Scout leader, and a career woman on top of all that -- and I think this is an impossibility unless you are just an absolute Amazon, and that what the colleges should be preparing women for is to learn to tolerate a kind of flexible exchange system with yourself.

I speak with great passion on this topic because it has taken me twelve years to unlearn and to learn to have this kind of an exchange system with myself, such that if there is a deadline to be met in one's work, or a conference to go to, you can say without any guilt -- and that is the point -- how to do this without a sense of failure as a woman; to be able to let the house go, even tell a child, "Don't bother me now, like your father tells you when he is busy; don't bother me now, I have to do this. Let's get together in three hours," and to do this without guilt -- and I can't stress that strongly enough because if it is done with guilt you are not performing well in that thing you are trying to save time for.

In the same way, if there is a need of the family, a male should feel, without guilt, fully justified that he can't go to that conference, or he can't stay at the office until seven. This is easier for the male to do in our society and he tends to let the family and his own psychic needs and his marriage and his community obligations go by the board. Sometimes that comes back at him when he is 45 and realizes that he has reared two strangers and has some regret, but I can't stress enough that I think that this ability, to the extent that the colleges can help a woman acquire it, is absolutely fundamental to an ease of coping with a complex combination of roles in a complex and complicated world.

You see, I have ended up with a "soap box" speech as well as some research implications.

APPENDIX III

BACKGROUND SUMMARY

(Conference on Undergraduate Education for Women)

The trend of single-sex colleges to coeducation and to coordinate relationships has accelerated over the past year. The reasons advanced range from pragmatic considerations of enrollment forecasts to more subtle and complex socio-cultural arguments. Some view the trend as a bandwagon response and raise questions about the validity of the rationalizations given for changes in status. The purpose of this paper, prepared for the July, 1969 conference on the undergraduate education of women, is to provide a capsule background of the development of women's colleges, to summarize reasons given for changing to coeducation or coordinate relationships and those given for continuing uni-sex institutions. This synthesis is viewed as a "point of departure" for conference discussions.

The conference will attempt to assess the implications for women's education of such factors as differences in traits between the sexes, present and projected roles for women, and the growing trend toward coeducation. In these contexts attention will focus on the educational viability of women's colleges. What are the implications of current research for the education of women? Can a case be made for proceeding somewhat differently in certain respects in the education of women than in the education of men? If special objectives are needed in the education of women, can they be more readily achieved in a women's college than in a coeducational institution? What possible programs, emphases, pilot experiments and procedures appropriate to the education of women should women's colleges undertake? Are there areas where data are inadequate or nonexistent and research is needed?

America's first colleges were founded early in the seventeenth century to educate men, primarily for the ministry and for the legal profession. Not until after the Civil War did the higher education of women assume significant proportions. Through most of the nineteenth century the conviction persisted that women could not meet the intellectual standards of men's institutions; that they could not endure the physical demands of higher education; that the education of women would have an adverse effect on the institution of marriage and the family.

Prior to the 19th century formal education for girls of any age was not deemed necessary. Although they might attend the early dame schools of the eighteenth century to learn to read a little, not until the end of that century is there any record of their being allowed to attend the public elementary schools. In 1824 the first public high school for girls was opened in Worcester. Soon they were being accepted in these high schools with boys and given the same training - preparation for college. The number enrolled was small, but inevitably they aspired to admission to college.

In the ninteenth century the pioneering of such women as Emma Willard, Catherine Beecher, and Mary Lyon culminated in the first women's colleges. Among the early four-year institutions leading to the A.B. degree were Georgia Female College (1836), Mary Sharp College (1850), Elmira College (1855), and Vassar (1861). Coeducation was the exception; only in isolated cases were women admitted (i.e., Oberlin in 1837, Hillsdale in 1844, and Antioch in 1853).

The incentive to found women's colleges was part of the feminist movement toward equal opportunities for women. A related impetus was the need of a growing nation to provide more teachers for its expanding school systems. With the admission of girls to elementary and secondary schools, the demand for women teachers increased. The preparation of teachers was a strong element in the curriculum in the early years of women's academies and colleges although the educational program actually was very similar to that provided in institutions for men. Traditionally, women's colleges have aspired to curriculums patterned after those of the prestigious male colleges.

In 1870 the official estimate of the number of women students enrolled in institutions of higher learning in the

United States was approximately 11,000 or one-fourth of the total enrollment. However, only 3,000 women were in institutions granting the bachelor's degree. Of these approximately 2,200 were attending women's colleges. Not more than 600 were in private coeducational colleges; about 200 were enrolled in the eight state universities open to them.

Following the Civil War there was a rapid increase in the number of institutions open to women. New women's colleges were founded, and by the close of the century women were admitted to many major universities and land grant colleges. By 1957, 74 per cent of the institutions of higher education in the United States were coeducational. Today that figure is higher, with less than 10 per cent of all women in higher education attending women's colleges. The number of women's colleges is declining; in 1964 there were but 37 nondenominational liberal arts colleges for women. (Kirkland College, opened in 1968 and the first nonsectarian women's college to be founded since Sarah Lawrence in 1928 and Bennington in 1932, has a coordinate relationship with Hamilton College.) The prevailing pattern in higher education is public and coeducational or coordinate.

The reasons given by uni-sex institutions for changing their status include the following:

1) Enrollment forecasts suggest a decline in quantity and quality of students in men's and women's colleges, with major financial implications.

2) This in turn reflects the view of students that segregation of the sexes is anachronistic, and the current preference of undergraduates for large urban universities "where the action is."

3) A concern for human rights makes segregation by sex as untenable as that of race and creed.

4) The differing perspectives, attitudes, ideas and thinking of men and women create greater stimulation and enrichment for both students and faculty in the classroom as well as in extracurricular educational programs.

5) A coeducationally integrated community provides a "natural" setting more nearly approximating the male-female environment of the off-campus world.

6) Coeducation improves the social life of the campus community because students may be less likely to spend weekends off campus.

7) Culturally, women students improve and enrich the campus because of their traditional initiative and support in relation to the arts, drama, music, etc.

8) The integrated environment is more conducive to providing time and opportunity for students to know and respect one another as individuals and not primarily as "sex objects."

9) Women are playing increasingly important roles in the economic and political life of the nation and need the educational background provided by the broader curricular opportunities of the larger coeducational institutions.

10) Professionally, there is a national need for highly trained women in professions once open only to men; training for these professions is generally obtainable only in universities.

11) Institutions with male students seem more likely to be recipients of grants and funds from business and government with their interest in professionally educated men.

12) And finally, the major historical reasons for the establishment of separate men's and women's colleges no longer exist.

The proponents of women's colleges submit the following rationale for their survival:

1) Recent psychological and educational research indicates that sex is one of the important

factors differentiating students' performance, attitudes and aspirations. Women's colleges have an obvious potential for changing in response to such data and initiating further related research.

2) The college years are crucial for establishing individual identity; for women this includes special attention to and recognition of feminineness and its implications. Women need an awareness of the cultural context of their lives in America if they aspire to be other than a relatively powerless group in contemporary society.

3) Self-realization and self-confidence are stimulated by an environment which obviates the need for complex relationships and competition with the masculine ego in campus educational programs.

4) Women are first class citizens on their own campuses with opportunities to develop their capacities as leaders without the cultural handicaps inherent in the coeducational milieu.

5) There is some evidence that, without the presence of male students, women are more likely to select courses and careers in such areas as the physical sciences and mathematics, usually perceived by coeds as masculine choices.

6) More serious study goes on when women are not distracted by men on campus with concomitant dating and emotional involvements. Some women are reluctant to appear smarter than men in the classroom.

7) There is a need to re-establish the special attributes and distinctiveness of each sex through attention to their special strengths and virtues, in view of speculation that there is currently a movement toward unisexuality

(evidenced in apparel, changing concepts of what is masculine and what is feminine, shifting sexual mores, etc.).

8) By definition, women's colleges should be more responsive than coeducational institutions to experimental programs and innovation related to the needs, professional motivation and varying life styles of women.

9) There is concern that a women's college accepting male students would attract men applicants of inferior quality and thus reduce the overall excellence of the institution.

10) And finally, in a society committed to the concept of pluralism, maintaining a diversity of institutions of higher learning will perpetuate distinctive options for those who seek to fill special needs and aspirations.

APPENDIX IV

EXCERPTS FROM
PRESENTATIONS BY PAULINE TOMPKINS

Tuesday Evening Session, July 8, 1969

We hope that perhaps as a result of our meetings here and some of the things which we may identify as areas in which we should be doing some research or some pilot experimental programs, that some of the institutions here will actually give some indication of wanting to assume responsibility in this respect and that later on, perhaps next spring or no later than that, we would have a follow-up with each of you to find out what has actually transpired.

We thought it would be helpful to include colleges which are committed to remaining women's colleges, those which are frankly on the fence at this time, those which may have made a decision to go coeducational, those which are exploring various coordinate relationships, to get in a sense the whole bag together and bring a number of perspectives.

We also wanted geographic representation and we have it with the West Coast, the Middle West, the Northeast and the Southeast here. We wanted older, newer, larger, smaller, church-related, non-church-related colleges, and as you can see as you meet the delegates or look at the list, we have this kind of representation.

We all share in common, regardless of what our ultimate decisions may be as separate institutions, a concern about the undergraduate education of women, and this I expect is the point of departure for us.

We developed the agenda so that it parallels the Statement of Objectives. We hope, too, that there is a progression in it which we intended, a progression from a review of research, of college studies, of our approaches to and concern about the problems of undergraduate education of women, to a kind of benchmark or watershed at which point, then, on the basis of these earlier discussions, we address ourselves to what we as colleges might do by way of applying some of the implications of our research or of the self-studies to our own institutions as they are discussed here.

I would like to suggest that perhaps there are several points we should keep in mind, or at least our committee as we worked on this agenda and the thinking behind this conference hoped we would keep in mind, as we begin our discussions. The first, of course, is what to many of us is the futility and indeed the irrelevance of an academic debate -- academic in the worst sense of that word -- on the merits of single-sex vs. coeducational education. It seems to us -- and I think perhaps all of you would share this -- that the arguments on this are double-edged; that neither side can win this debate on points, and that indeed those of us who argue ardently in favor of women's colleges one day may find ourselves in the position of having to justify just as ardently our arguments for coeducation or coordinate education the next day. It makes me think of the story, which is a true story, of a Soviet Diplomat in the early post-World War II years who attended a meeting at which was discussed a question of international significance and he appeared at the conference arguing very, very strongly for a particular point of view, and then was called suddenly to Moscow and when he came back three days later he found himself saying, "I disagree with everything I said when I was here before. In fact, I disagree more than I ever thought I could."

I think at least some of the major reasons for institutions stating that they are remaining women's colleges or moving to coeducation have been summarized in the background paper, and we would like, unless you want to pick them up and debate them, to leave them there and to use this as a kind of jumping-off point.

After all, many of these arguments are of a kind of ex post facto character. They are presented in order to justify, if we are frank with each other, a decision which has been reached for reasons which may have very little to do with the social, philosophical, cultural, sexual differences between men and women and the reasons why, therefore they should or should not be educated in the same institution. The fact is that women are wanting to go to coeducational colleges and men are wanting to go to coeducational colleges, and a number of institutions, including a number of us here, are frankly concerned about where our better women students are coming from in the next few years and, therefore, it may be too easy for us and too facile to resort to sophisticated sociological or other arguments as to why we ought to go coeducational when it is a very pragmatic question for us.

The second thing we might keep in mind is a need to recognize the disparate and often passive reasons which women's colleges have for their status as single-sex institutions. One can mention, for example, just the fact of tradition, which brings a kind of inertia to all of us, I expect, and this is buttressed by the fact that because we have always been women's colleges, we may, God willing, continue infinitely to be women's colleges and that there will, after all, always be some women who prefer to come to institutions of our type; and so we tend to rely, although I think our reliance has been somewhat shaken of late, on prophecies such as that made in Jencks' and Reisman's book of a year ago, "The Academic Revolution," in which they suggested that women's colleges were, indeed, anachronistic today, but that the better women's colleges had nothing to fear because they would always have more than they could possible take of highly qualified women students knocking at their doors, and already less than a year after that book has come out, some of these institutions no longer buy that philosophy.

But inertia, tradition, location is another passive reason. Here we are at Cedar Crest College in Allentown with five other institutions within easy commuting distance and without arguing the merits of a women's college as such, we can say, "Well, after all, we have the best of both possible worlds by remaining, retaining our integrity as a college for women and at the same time developing very close inter-institutional relationships with the other institutions on our horizon.

And then, of course, another passive reason that may be very important is that some of us may feel that the cost of converting to coeducation is simply prohibitive.

A third point we might keep in mind is, I guess, the other side of this coin, and that is the fact that it seems that to date there are probably very few women's colleges which have really made the case very vigorously or convincingly for the separate education of women, or as we put it in the agenda and in the Statement of Objectives, for proceeding somewhat differently in some important respects in the education of women than in the education of men. Even if we tried to make this case, we have not perhaps as much to show for it in the sense of the distinctiveness of our educational program as one might wish.

I expect that this is a major reason why you responded, as 95 percent of all the colleges we wrote to did respond, so quickly and enthusiastically to the idea of having this particular conference. We are on the defensive. Perhaps our failure to come through with a strong case for the survival of women's colleges reflects in part -- I am sure it does -- the toughness of this task. There are widespread differences of opinion, honest differences of opinion regarding the purpose of educating women, their roles, their futures, and so on, and certainly it is a subject which is fraught with many built-in prejudices and value judgments.

We know, unhappily, that some of the experiments in trying to develop women's colleges with a distinctive flavor have kind of boomeranged. We are all familiar with Lynn White's attempt at Mills in the 1950's with the thought that a women's college ought to educate our daughters to their roles as wives and mothers, and when Lynn White left Mills so did this kind of program go with him. Perhaps this has frightened some of the rest of us off.

One might also suggest that it would be easier today for wholly new institutions to be created for women with the objective of establishing a distinctive program than for old tried and tested institutions to make any very fundamental changes in their outlook on this subject; and then one looks back to the founding of Bennington and Sarah Lawrence and the appeal which they had in their earlier years, particularly as pioneering institutions, and then one says: But alas what has happened to them as women's colleges in more recent years?

Ten years ago Mable Newcomer wrote her best seller on "A Century of Higher Education for Women," and a quotation from it I think summarizes what I have said. This was 1959.

> "As for the women's colleges, I have sometimes prophesied that they will be converted to coeducational institutions or die in another twenty years. Some are not even asserting that they have positive values. They are arguing, it seems to me, that they are just as good as coeducational colleges.
>
> "Many have been stirring uneasily. There has been more than the usual study by committees and long debates in faculty meetings, but thus far the results of such deliberations have been disappointingly few. Most of the revisions, however desirable, have been of a minor nature, and majority votes have frequently been obtained by logrolling rather than a clear consensus. There appears to be no real agreement and even no real conviction of need for drastic changes."

Then I think perhaps in one way the response which you and we here at the college have made to one of the points in regard to this conference suggests our relative failure to come forth with any resounding reasons for our survival as single-sex institutions. On April 3, we raised the query in a Progress Report to you as to the extent to which women's colleges and coeducational institutions had been considering the need for or the advantage in proceeding somewhat differently with the education of women, and in raising this question asked specifically whether colleges invited to this conference had given thought to this question, had come up with answers philosophically or in terms of programs, and the response which came in in most instances was a response which suggested that we are not getting to this subject and we have committees working on it, but we certainly don't have the answers yet.

And so we come back to the main theme and this is where I shall conclude these remarks and turn the meeting over to your Chairman: Is there a case, can a case be made for proceeding somewhat differently in the education of women than in the education of men; and if so, can women's colleges perhaps more felicitously lend themselves to this endeavor than coeducational institutions -- not meaning to say that coeducational institutions cannot, but is there a role here as a pioneer for women's colleges?

In the next two days, we shall be talking about some of the arguments which might be advanced for such a case, such as differences in the life styles and roles of men and women, differences in their traits, in their implications for the education of women, differences in their attitudes, their aspirations and in their backgrounds. To this, I would add one further consideration which we might have, and that is a recognition that in contrast to the period when I guess any of us was founded as an institution, today higher education in the United States is not only a massive and universal endeavor but institutions of higher education have become, as never before in our history, integral to and very responsible for the efforts of this country to try to find a resolution of some of the most serious and gravest problems which confront us as a people, as a society, as a nation.

One could ask the question whether there might perhaps be available to us through research on this, through experimentation, some reason for feeling that perhaps women may have some different insights to bring to some of these problems than men do, and if so, is there any way in which women's colleges could address themselves to this particular facet of the problem?

I guess what I am saying, in sum, is that although none of us regard ourselves as a hideout for women who don't want to risk coeducation, certainly too few of us regard ourselves as way-out institutions in the sense of trying at this point, or at least having found or discovered at this point a sufficiently vigorous raison d'etre so that if we were to leave tonight we would go home feeling that we had any of the answers to this question.

Thursday Morning Session, July 10, 1969

First, because this may be the last chance I will have to say so, I do want to thank all of you for coming. It is not often that we are able to get a group of very busy and important people in the middle of the summer to come and spend a couple of days talking about a subject which is as tough, and sometimes as elusive, as this subject.

We have felt the need here at Cedar Crest for this kind of meeting because we are addressing ourselves to our future as a women's college and we had hoped that something would come out of this which would give substance and weight to some of the arguments we might advance -- and I am sure that many of you feel the same way.

So, thank you very much. We appreciate your being here and it has been a pleasure to have an opportunity to introduce you to this campus, and I think for all of us to have had the opportunity to share and exchange some of our concerns.

I suppose that the main question which we might take as our starting point, and must take as our starting point and keep in the back of our minds whenever we address ourselves to the question of our future, is whether we are satisfied with what we are doing today to educate women, and if we are willing to say: Well, we are doing a good job and it is too bad if we have to go by the board for financial or other reasons, but we are satisfied with what we are doing educationally, this is one thing. I don't think there are very many of us here, really, however, who in our deepest academic souls would feel quite at ease with this kind of complacency.

We have had really less than two days of conference. We have had a lot of good talk; we have shared some of our ideas, but I think we all feel -- and I am really paralleling and building on what Mr. Logan has said -- that to date, at this point in the agenda if we were to leave after just further discussion this morning of various issues that concern the various ones of us, we would have a feeling that somehow, whatever there might have been here would be rather quickly dissipated and we would go back to our respective campuses thinking there had been some good discussions but it had just been another conference -- and I suppose one of the reasons that foundations in general shy away from wanting to back conferences is because so frequently they have this kind of nebulous outcome.

In other words, it is important that we have met but it is not enough that we have met. I think we all feel -- at least those of us who were discussing this informally last night I think shared this feeling -- that we need some kind of sense of corporateness as a result of our discussions.

Certainly, the women's colleges that are not here -- and we obviously could not include all women's colleges, had they all been interested in coming -- those that have decided to go coeducational, those that are sitting on the fence, if there is no real outcome of this conference other than to say that we discussed the questions and we agreed that they were very serious and we ought to apply ourselves with renewed vigor to their solution, I think would say, "Well, there was nothing really to learn from this and if we have made a decision to go coeducational, probably we made it rightly, and if we have been sitting on the fence, perhaps there is no outcome of a conference of this sort and we had better make that kind of decision."

There is another reason, however, for us to come up with some rather affirmative and concrete statements. Our situation as colleges, the whole question of the education of women, and today in particular with the excruciating problems that confront us as a society and as a people, and as women, as a world, as educators -- the whole situation is desperate and, therefore, somehow we must respond to this by what we say about ourselves as colleges for women.

Early this morning I looked at the program and our statement of conference objectives and thought rather quickly of what we had done by way of trying to fulfill the objective of the conference. It says that we are here to explore the educational validity of women's colleges in the context of such factors as implications of differences in traits between the sexes, present and projected roles for women, and the growing trend toward coeducation.

I think we have spent some time specifically on each of these and each of these has intruded itself into the discussion of other things which we have been considering. However, as Mr. Logan has suggested, perhaps the hidden agenda here has been our overriding concern about, as Mrs. Rossi pointed out, these hard questions: our economic viability and maybe the false lure of coeducation as a quick, not so easy but at least perhaps the one solution that we can see on the horizon which we might all opt for as a way out in case the monetary situation gets too painful for us to continue as we are.

We are aware of the fact that the historical reasons for the establishment of women's colleges, the fact that women had no access to education otherwise, higher education, the fact that many parents a generation or a century ago wanted, and even up to this century, institutions that were sexually segregated as a means in a sense of protecting their daughters -- these and similar reasons are no longer valid. They have no validity.

I think we are aware of the fact that we have been educating women and we have taken pride in this in a sense as though they were men, by providing them with a curriculum which is, we hope, as good as the curriculum which we provide for men students; but alas today some of us would have to admit that for financial reasons and lack of pulling power for faculty, resources, and so on, maybe we are not even educating our daughters as well as we educate our men and, therefore, another reason for our existence may seem to be in question.

And so now today we have a trend to coeducation with reasons going all the way from the fad of the moment to the desire of young people and of our whole society to become more homogenized in roles and sexes, and so on, to the very basic economic reasons, and in a sense this puts us really out on a limb. Again, as Mr. Logan has suggested, coeducation may be a delusion as far as its being a solution to our dilemma. It may be a quicksand for us, because it is not just that small independent women's colleges are faced with financial problems but that small independent colleges, coeducational colleges, share this same financial bind and when

Mrs. Rossi suggested yesterday that perhaps in thirty years the last women's colleges would be extinct for various reasons, including I am sure the financial reason, one could almost make the same prediction about many, many, many, many liberal arts colleges, small colleges, coeducational institutions.

During a day and a half conference, obviously, one can only scratch the surface of these concerns. Perhaps this conference has stimulated in us a recognition of the need to go further -- I am sure it has -- but we have not gone very far here and let me suggest this by noting, in a sense stealing Martha Church's thunder in her summary of the conference this afternoon -- I am not sure whether she will be grateful or resentful -- but if we look at what we have addressed ourselves to, certainly it is true that we have addressed ourselves to the implications of differences in traits between the sexes and some of the implications this has for education; we have alluded yesterday and at various times to some of the research which has been done; we have suggested some research needs but not in any real priority or perhaps even qualitatively rated way; and I think perhaps what is needed here is to identify areas where we really would benefit by some hard and persistent research -- not dreaming up research projects that take us away from the immediate problem at hand but which will have something very specific to say to our needs in regard to the education of women.

At the same time, one must enter two exceptions to this, or two warnings: one, that again as was pointed out in the course of this conference, the research that is available, and perhaps even the research we may do, may not necessarily be conclusive and perhaps should not be determinative of what we are going to do in the future in the education of women.

It was also suggested to us that there is much research that has been done in recent years that may be really quite obsolete and meaningless, irrelevant today in view of the revolution that is going on in social patterns and mores, and so on.

Another point which was made -- and I think made by Mrs. Rossi and which many of us would agree with, perhaps not enough of us -- is that our destinies as institutions for women should not be irrevocably tied to specific research outcome. Perhaps there is a need now for us to do some not starry-eyed but pretty fundamental philosophizing about what we are after as colleges for women, what things we can do today, and research be hanged. Let's make the cause for future research on the basis of what we co because of our convictions.

As for the second objective, that is, the educational validity of women's colleges in the context of present and projected roles for women, we have talked a little bit about this but, again, very superficially. I don't think we have really in any basic or exciting sense addressed ourselves to what is happening of fundamentally revolutionary nature in the world around us which has to do not only with such things as our role as a nation in the context of military-political rivalries but has to do with such things as the cybercultural revolutions and the different roles and needs which many of us, men and women, will be confronted with in the world of tomorrow. We haven't tried to put this conference in the context of the world of 1984 or the world of 2000 and to draw a picture of different needs which we will face at that time, or what we ought to be doing to get ready for that time, or to determine what the contours of that age are going to be.

We have got at, indirectly, this question last night very specifically in talking about the problem of the education of black students and the responsibility of women's colleges in this connection, but we haven't done very much in this area.

We did hear of one or two colleges that are concerned in regard to our failure to prepare women for the lives that they are going to lead. We heard from Goucher in Mr. Farley's report suggestions in regard to courses related to women and their interests. We have heard Mrs. Rossi's suggestions of how she is going to get at some of these points without using the word "women" as such but getting at some very basic issues with which we should be concerned, and which have implications for women.

We heard Mrs. Rossi talk about the need -- and this is approaching the thing I am trying to say, not very successfully -- for women, as well as men, but for women to become involved in real life, not sitting on the sidelines in an academic stance, and she suggested to some of us, I don't know whether to the group as a whole, that, for example, we might be thinking of such things as having women students not live on campus but live in the community in the midst of where the social problems are and see them at first hand. This may be too rich blood for some of us; we wonder what we are going to do with our dormitories -- we could rent them out for conference purposes, I suppose -- but this suggests a qualitatively different kind of thinking that probably we ought to be addressing ourselves to.

She also suggested that we need to educate persons of sensibility, of understanding, of willingness to confront conditions in society, and I think the implication here is that the way one does this is by becoming involved during the undergraduate years as part of one's educational program rather than simply studying about rather remotely some of these problems and then hoping that there will be a carry-over and we will know better how to cope with them, as women, as educated persons, after we finish our undergraduate course.

I don't think we have really considered here such elusive questions as the different insights and values that women might bring to bear on some of these very pressing, and almost fatal in their implications, problems which concern us as a society today, and yet there is room for curricular experimentation here. There is room for exploration in teaching methods and approaches, and so on.

One can say that these and other things are objectives that could apply to men's institutions, to coeducational institutions, that what is needed for the education of women, this type of approach, could be instituted by coeducational institutions, but we raised the question and I bring it back to you again this morning, whether some of these objectives might not initially be more readily followed through on, implemented, in colleges which are dedicated to the education of women and which are not in a sense detoured by the more immediate traditional, pressing and recognized and accepted objectives of men in going to college. In other words, we have perhaps more reason to think that women's colleges, if they would, could frankly be more experimental. We have less to lose if we look at the numbers of women who go on to graduate school; we can certainly afford to be more independent of the graduate school pressures on undergraduate education.

This does not mean that coeducational colleges, if we were to initiate some of these new starts, would not take them over in time. What it would mean is that women's colleges were once again assuming a kind of pioneering role -- and I don't think we would run out of things and areas in which we could pioneer in the future.

I think I sense, if not a confusion in regard to our role and place in higher education -- and perhaps I am reading this conference wrong -- but I think I sense a kind of conservatism and also an apprehension whenever we get down to the nitty-gritty of what we might do that is more than just provide a good education and not emphasize whether this is education for women or for men. This isn't enough today and perhaps that is a way of avoiding one of the more crucial factors. I sense the conservatism when I hear us saying to each other, "Well, you know, if you have a course in such-and-such, or try to do this-and-this-and-this pedagogically, our faculty wouldn't buy it," and I wonder if sometimes some of us as administrators may use this as a convenient excuse for covering up on our own unwillingness to buy it ourselves. Where is the role for strong leadership if it doesn't come from a group of persons who are chosen to be in a position of leadership and at least to set some sights?

I don't think we can say we cannot afford to come out strongly and vigorously for new initiatives and a philosophy justifying women's education, because some of us may feel in the next two or three or five or ten years that we are going to have to go coeducational and, therefore, we would be out on a limb and, therefore, we must keep our options dry, as it were. It seems to me we have to recognize that we are in a time of really quiet, and not so quiet, desperation, a time when in a sense we have nothing to lose but everything, and we need perhaps to take the initiative in being experimental.

If we don't, I am afraid that what I have detected is true of a few persons here, detected in what they have said or implied, may be true of all of us, that if we simply try to do the same old job with excellence as our criterion, we will end up with (and I am exaggerating to make the point) a kind of middle-class education for middle-class women who are going to lead middle-class lives on the periphery of our major problems in our society.

Probably what we need -- and I suggested this the other night -- are new colleges, but obviously, psychologically as well as economically, this is not the day for establishing new women's colleges. If it is hard for us to get women of the quality and the quantity we want in established institutions, it might be even more difficult to do so today, and certainly it would be difficult to get the funding for them.

Instead, it suggests to us that what is really needed is that we embark on a process of transforming ourselves. Perhaps we would carry more weight with our own faculties -- and I come back now to this conference -- who may be resistant to any substantial change if we suggest to them that eighteen women's colleges, meeting for a few days of intensive discussions, concluded that this was our most viable option and that, indeed, it was mandatory for us to do something of this sort.

I think if we look at what we are doing today, we would agree that much of it is sound and much of it makes a case for the education of women, but perhaps what we need to do, among other things, is to catalogue it in order to make the point, and then go further in it. For example, in the area of curriculum, many of us are beginning to put emphasis on independent study. So are coeducational institutions, so are men's colleges, but I think we can make a case that because they are out of circulation for various periods of time to a greater or lesser extent, they perhaps have a greater need when they are undergraduates for the kind of self-starting and self-propelling self-education than normally occurs in a regular orthodox classroom procedure; so perhaps we ought to make more of a thing of this and put more effort in our direct development of courses in the area of independent study.

In the field of counseling, we talk about counseling programs and we talk about what we are doing for mature women who are coming back, but again if we recognize that women lead different lives from men, why wait until they come back at age 35? Why not do a great deal more than any of us is presently doing to invest our whole counseling procedure with a relevance and an awareness of the needs that our young college graduates are going to face, with an awareness of kinds of occupations and professions which might lend themselves more readily to women's life styles, and so on? I think this is the kind of point I am trying to make here. We are doing some of this. Why don't we make more of a virtue of it?

I think it might help just to acknowledge that women are not men; that their goals, their motivations, their needs are not the same in all instances as those of men and, therefore, that what is educationally relevant for men, and which has been the traditional fare in most colleges, may not be totally so or equally relevant for women, and if we acknowledge that then it seems to me that it is not enough to say: We are doing a good job, as good a job as a coeducational institution. We have then got to address ourselves to what educational needs of women are and how we can cope with them -- and please don't take this as a plea for going into home economics courses or things which we associated with women of a generation or two ago, but in the context of the new roles, the new lives, the new times and the sense of involvement which young women today want to feel. How can we educate for this?

. . . .

Then, it would seem to me very important that we agree to keep in touch with each other. When we first started talking about this conference, we suggested that this be one of two -- one at this point followed by some research, experimentation, and then a further conference the following summer to see where we had got. It is too early, perhaps, for us to talk in these terms. We would need additional help from outside if we were to do this, but certainly we do have funds to enable us to keep in touch with what each of us is doing as a result of this conference or spurred by this conference -- maybe things quite different from anything we have thought about here -- and I see no reason why it would not be possible, and indeed every reason why it might be extremely important for us to plan to have at least a nuclear group from the institutions represented at this conference work on a plan for another meeting at which the results of this conference fed in to us here over the next months might be discussed and we might use this as a kind of really brainstorming session in which we would do some further perhaps more creative thinking in regard to our longer-range future.

So, I think what I am saying is that time has indeed run out for us as women's colleges. I don't think that we are in a sense trying to be self-serving -- we simply don't want to see an educational institution go down the drain for lack of students or financing -- but if we can make the case that women's colleges may indeed in a time of increasing homogenization throughout our culture have something significant to do, a role to play, then certainly this is the time to make it because, believe me, if we end up going coeducational and thus delay the date of our extinction by a few more years, if we indeed all go coeducational, then it seems to me that we have lost our last chance of saying, with any real opportunity or possibility of implementing, the fact that women and their education has an importance which can perhaps be best pursued through institutions which take this as their _raison d'etre_.